# The American Ecclesiastical Review

Vol. CXXII, No. 5 MAY, 1950

CONTENTS

An Important Roman Instruction
*Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 321

How Near Is Evening Mass? . *Gerald Ellard, S.J.* 331

Apostolic Consecration to Mary . *Robert Knopp, S.M.* 345

"Americanism" Reviewed by Abbé Felix Klein
*Thomas T. McAvoy,* C.S.C. 355

We Owe It to Our Nuns. Part I . *Daniel A. Lord, S.J.* 364

The Baptismal Character and Membership in the Catholic Church . . . . . *Joseph Clifford Fenton* 373

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

Oscillation in the Distribution of Holy Communion . . 382

The Use of Synthetic Ashes . . . . . 382

Repetition of the Apostolic Blessing for the Sick . . . 383

What Necessity Justifies the Short Form of Extreme Unction 383

Coalescence of Repeated Thefts . . . . . 384

The Obligation of the *Missa pro populo* . . . . . 385

Gum-chewing During Mass . . . . . 386

(*Contents Continued on Next Page*)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1950, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

A Sterilizing Operation . . . . . 386

ANALECTA . . . . . 388

BOOK REVIEWS

Introduction to the Devout Life, *translated and edited by John K. Ryan* . . . . . 394

St. Ignatius of Loyola, *by Paul Dudon, S.J.* . . . . . 395

The Christian Virtues, *by Charles Sheedy, C.S.C.* . . . . 397

The Liturgical Altar, *by Geoffrey Webb* . . . . . 398

Two Ways of Life, *by F. Sherwood Taylor* . . . . . 399

To Heaven Through a Window, *by John Carr* . . . . 399

BOOK NOTES . . . . . 400

**WHY . . . . *you should consider***

**THE HOLY LAND ART COMPANY**

When in need of vestments or material for vestments can be simply stated in these words:

YOU MAY CHOOSE excellent Gothic or Roman vestments, *for immediate delivery*, from a large stock, made by our own skilled needleworkers in this country; or

YOU MAY SELECT beautiful vestments from samples on display at our store and have them made abroad especially for you; also

YOU MAY PURCHASE, by the yard, at our store, superb brocades, damasks, orphreys and appliques, either domestic or imported; and

YOU MAY BE SURE of getting at the Holy Land Art Company correct liturgical designs and colors at the lowest possible prices consistent with the high quality of our products.

TO: HOLY LAND ART CO.
55 BARCLAY STREET, NEW YORK 7, N. Y.
Please send me:
☐ Information about Vestments
☐ Samples of Materials. (Please state color desired.)
Name.....
Address.....
City.....Zone.....
State.....

*You are invited to visit us or mail the coupon stating your requirements*

**Holy Land Art Co.**
Est. 1922
ALPHONSE TONIETTI
*Now With*
Bernardini Studios
55 Barclay Street
New York 7, N. Y.
Telephone WOrth 2-2130

*In answering advertisements please mention* THE AMERICAN ECCLESIASTICAL REVIEW

## AN IMPORTANT ROMAN INSTRUCTION

On Dec. 20, 1949, the Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office issued a lengthy and detailed instruction to local Ordinaries concerning the manner and measure in which Catholics may participate in conferences and discussions with non-Catholics with a view to procuring greater unity among Christians—"ecumenical" gatherings, as the Instruction calls them—borrowing the usual Protestant term. The instruction begins with the statement that the Catholic Church earnestly prays that all who believe in Christ shall be "made perfect in one," [1] and adds that the desire for the return of all Christians to unity, which is growing daily in the hearts of many who are separated from the Catholic Church, is doubtless due to the prayers of the faithful, aided by the grace of the Holy Spirit. However, it goes on to say, some of the efforts toward the reconciliation of non-Catholics with the Catholic Church have not been based on correct principles, and have even been fraught with danger. For this reason the Holy Office, charged with the duty of preserving the faith in its integrity, has deemed it opportune to recall and prescribe the points to be mentioned in the Instruction.

The body of the Instruction is divided into eight numbered paragraphs; however, the subjects it treats can be suitably classified under four general headings: (1) The background and preparation for the work of the "ecumenical movement"; (2) The method of proposing Catholic doctrine in the prosecution of this work; (3) The conditions under which meetings between Catholics and non-Catholics may be conducted; and (4) Several particular points and admonitions.

(1) As a preamble, the Instruction states that the work of promoting "reunion" belongs primarily to the Bishops of the Church, and they are bound to promote it in such wise that those who are seeking the true Church may be helped to find it, and that the members of the Church may not be injured by the dangers which readily follow activities of "the ecumenical movement".

Evidently, then, priests and lay persons may not engage in this work save by the authorization of the Bishop. The Bishop is ad-

[1] *John* 17:23.

monished to choose for this work priests who are well acquainted with the teaching of the Church, and particularly with the doctrine laid down in three Encyclicals—Leo XIII's *Satis cognitum* on the constitution and unity of the Church, Pius XI's *Mortalium animos* on the promotion of true religious unity, and Pius XII's *Mystici Corporis Christi* on the Church as the Mystical Body of Christ.

Bishops are also admonished to be vigilant over the observance of the canons, which prescribe censorship for books written by Catholics, and of the laws prohibiting certain types of books. Mention is made of non-Catholic publications which are likely to be read or edited or sold by Catholics. I would regard as examples of books over which such vigilance would be called for those which sometimes appear as "Good Will Books" on the "Religious Book List," issued by the National Conference of Christians and Jews, and which apparently are recommended to all persons, (since they are approved by a Catholic, a Protestant and a Jew), though some of them should certainly be banned to Catholics, such as one which speaks of the "delusion that one's own church, cult, sect or group alone expresses God's will on earth, that it alone can reveal God's purposes toward mankind."[2]

Other works of pastoral zeal recommended to the Bishops are the establishment of "information centers" for non-Catholics who are desirous of finding the truth, and ways and means whereby converts can receive a more thorough grounding in the faith, such as study-clubs and retreats. This last point should serve to remind us that in many parishes in our country no special attention is given to converts once they have been received into the Church. It is very evident from the Instruction that the mind of the Church is not being carried out in such cases.

(2) The section dealing with the method of proposing Catholic doctrine in the work of "reunion" is most significant. Actually it takes the form of various prohibitions and condemnations of false methods; and no one familiar with the "irenic" literature that has issued from Catholic sources in recent years can fail to perceive that such methods have been used—perhaps are still being used. There is the method of over-stressing the points of agreement between non-Catholic belief and the Catholic creed. This tendency,

[2] Cf. *AER*, CXIII, 5 (Nov. 1945), 385; CXV, 3 (Sept. 1946), 319.

the Instruction asserts, foments a dangerous indifferentism, especially among those who are not well grounded in matters theological; it results in a "whittling down" of Catholic doctrines so that their genuine sense is obscured and the purity of Catholic faith suffers.

Another method severely condemned by the Instruction is to allege that the doctrines taught in papal Encyclicals about the return of dissidents to the Church or the constitution of the Church or the Mystical Body of Christ, since they are not matters of faith, need not be taken too seriously.[3] It is true, what is stated in Encyclicals is frequently something that is not of divine faith; but Catholics must never forget that such teaching binds to internal acceptance as a matter of religious assent.[4] It is unfortunate that there is an impression among some non-Catholics nowadays, and even among some Catholics, that Catholics may reject the doctrines of the Encyclicals with perfect impunity. Thus, *Time* for Feb. 25, 1946, in speaking of the doctrine of Church and state, enunciated by Pope Leo XIII, made the erroneous statement: "Though Leo's views are still repeated by a few academic theologians, they are largely ignored by the U. S. hierarchy." [5] I myself have been in a group of presumably well-educated Catholics who undoubtedly thought that any statement of the Pope which is not an *ex cathedra* pronouncement may be freely doubted or denied. It behooves the Bishops and priests of our country to rectify these mistaken notions.

Still worse would it be, the Instruction goes on to say, if the impression were given to non-Catholics that the Catholic Church will not have its full perfection until they are again united to it—as if the Church were not already "in possession of the fulness of Christ." We find an echo of this last idea in an essay by a French Catholic priest, written several years ago, stating that "Christ will not be complete until He will have incorporated into

[3] It is interesting to note that the three doctrines here cited as taught in papal documents constitute the main theme of the three Encyclicals previously noted, with a change in order—*Mortalium animos, Satis cognitum,* and *Mystici Corporis Christi.*

[4] Cf. J. C. Fenton, *AER,* CXXI, 2 and 3 (Aug. and Sept. 1949), 126 ff., 210 ff.

[5] Cf. J. C. Fenton, *AER,* CXIV, 5 (May 1946), 369 ff.

Himself the whole man in each one of us and all the value of humanity scattered and multiplied throughout the world." [6]

The Instruction takes to task the custom of some Catholics of overemphasizing the evils prevailing in the Church before the Reformation. As is evident, such an attitude might tend to give the impression that the Reformation was actually justified. We must not forget that the main fact, as the Instruction points out, was the defection of so many from the true faith.

Methods of expounding Catholic doctrine which involve excessive display or a vehement method of procedure and treatment are also condemned. In this point we see the prudence of the Church, which would have us ever kindly and gentle and understanding in dealing with non-Catholics. We must presume that they are in good faith in their religious convictions until the opposite is proved.

The idea that good will can be won from non-Catholics by suppressing portions of Catholic teaching is also reprobated. The Instruction mentions explicitly as truths which may not be suppressed, the doctrines of the true nature and means of justification (one of the fundamental points of controversy with the original Reformers), the constitution of the Church, the primacy of jurisdiction of the Pope, and the fact that the only true union must consist in the return of non-Catholics to the one true Church. It is indeed a most unfortunate procedure to propose what claims to be an adequate presentation of the Catholic creed, and to omit or pass over lightly certain doctrines which may arouse the hostility of non-Catholics. We must follow the example of Christ and give "hard sayings" when we essay to expound Catholic doctrine in its entirety. The Instruction emphasizes this point by the use of italics: "*Tota* igitur et *integra* doctrina catholica est proponenda atque exponenda."

Non-Catholics may be told, the Instruction continues, that when they return to the Catholic Church they will lose none of the good which hitherto they have acquired, through God's grace. But, on the other hand, they may not be given the idea that their return will add any substantial perfection to the Church, as if it were still lacking something. An example of this erroneous notion appeared some years ago in an article by a priest in which it was stated that the visible Church has been rent asunder, but that

[6] Cf. *AER*, CXVII, 4 (Oct. 1947), 292.

the Mystical Body, being invisible, cannot be rent. The underlying notion of this statement was that the Catholic Church has lost its unity—an idea which is utterly false. It is interesting to note that whenever the Instruction uses the word "reunion" it puts it in quotation marks, to indicate that this expression, though it is used commonly, is not quite the correct word from the Catholic standpoint, since it might seem to imply that the unity which Christ promised as one of the notes of His Church, has been lost by the Catholic Church. "Reunion" in the Catholic sense means nothing else than the return of those who once departed from Catholicism to a unity that has never failed the true Church of Christ.

(3) The conditions under which meetings between Catholics and non-Catholics may be conducted or approved by Ordinaries are given in detail. The good feature of such meetings, the Instruction states, is that they furnish an opportunity for non-Catholics to acquire a knowledge of the Catholic faith; the bad feature is that they furnish danger of indifferentism. When an Ordinary believes that there will be good results, he should designate competent priests to explain and to defend Catholic teaching. However, the Instruction states, the laity should not attend such meetings unless they receive special permission from the ecclesiastical authorities, and this should not be given save to those who are well instructed and strong in the faith. If it is found that no good results can be hoped for from such gatherings, the faithful shall be prudently barred from them and the meetings themselves discontinued. The Instruction is particularly solicitous that large gatherings shall not be permitted, save after a most diligent investigation, since these are wont to produce little fruit and much danger.

As far as conferences with non-Catholic theologians are concerned, the Instruction commands that only priests be deputed who have proved themselves capable by their theological knowledge and their firm adherence to the principles and norms laid down by the Church.

Then the Instruction goes on to distinguish those gatherings of Catholics and non-Catholics which need ecclesiastical approval from those which do not. It refers to the *Monitum* issued by the Holy Office on June 5, 1948, which repeated the prescriptions of

the Code,[7] forbidding conferences and disputations with non-Catholics without the permission of the Holy See. Those gatherings come under the scope of this *Monitum,* the Instruction says, which have been organized with the understanding that both the Catholic and the non-Catholic parties expound and discuss their respective beliefs on an equal footing. However, it adds, certain other types of gatherings are permitted without special ecclesiastical authorization. Such, are catechetical instructions in which a Catholic imparts a knowledge of the faith to non-Catholics, and also conferences explaining Catholic doctrine to prospective converts. Even if on the occasion of such instructions or conference the non-Catholics explain the belief of their own church with a view to comparing it with Catholic doctrine, the meeting does not come under those requiring the permission of ecclesiastical authority, at least as far as the general law of the Church is concerned. Furthermore, the Instruction states, those meetings are not subject to the rules of the *Monitum* in which Catholics and non-Catholics assemble, not to discuss matters of faith and morals, but to consider in what ways they can offer a common defence of the fundamental principles of the natural law or of the Christian religion against the enemies of God, who are so powerful nowadays, or to deliberate on the restoration of social order or other questions of like nature. But, it adds, in such gatherings Catholics may not approve or concede anything at variance with divine revelation or the teaching of the Church—including its social teaching.

As an example, therefore, of a gathering not requiring special ecclesiastical authorization, we can take the case of a priest asked to address a group of Protestants in order to explain at their request some article of Catholic belief. Such a gathering does not come under the heading of a meeting in which both sides discuss their respective beliefs "on an equal footing" (*par cum pari agens*). Similarly, if Catholics meet with their fellow-citizens of other creeds to protest against an obscene motion picture that is being shown in the local theatre, or to uphold the efforts of a group of workingmen to obtain a living wage from their employers, or to voice their objections to an attempt to obtain legislation favoring euthanasia, the permission of higher ecclesiastical authorities is not required by the *Monitum.* Such meetings are directed only

[7] Can. 1258.

toward safeguarding principles of natural law. Even when there is question of upholding fundamental Christian principles, Catholics may unite with non-Catholics in a common effort. This statement of the Instruction is doubtless open to different interpretations. For, on the one hand, to come in this category a meeting must be one in which matters of faith and morals are not discussed, yet fundamental principles of the Christian religion are defended. The meaning seems to be that the principles are such as are admitted without hesitation by all the participants. For example, in a land under Communist domination Catholics and non-Catholics could unite in an effort to ban posters and newspapers casting ridicule on the doctrine of Christ's divinity. However, even in such a meeting Catholics could not favor any statement that is not conformable to Catholic teaching—for example, that non-Catholic churches have the same right to proclaim Christianity as the Catholic Church.

A canonical enactment is then promulgated in the Instruction. According to the *Monitum,* following the prescription of Canon 1325, § 3, only the Holy See may ordinarily grant Catholics permission to participate in assemblies with non-Catholics in which matters of faith and morals are treated by both parties on an equal footing. Now, however, for a period of three years from the date of publication of the Instruction—that is, until Dec. 20, 1952—local Ordinaries may authorize *local* meetings of this nature. By local meetings would seem to be meant those in which the participants reside in the same diocese, for a special provision is later made for interdiocesan meetings.

However, the Instruction lays down three conditions which must be observed in these local meetings—first, there must be no *communicatio in sacris;* second, there must be proper supervision and direction of the meetings; third, a Bishop in whose diocese such meetings have been held must report to the Holy Office at the end of each year, announcing that they have taken place and relating the experience gleaned from them.

A special paragraph is devoted in the Instruction to strictly theological gatherings. The same faculty to permit these is given to Ordinaries for a period of three years. Indeed, the Instruction adds, if several Ordinaries agree that one shall take charge of this type of meeting, they are free to do so. But in the report to the

Holy Office particular details must be announced—what questions were treated, who were present, and who were the speakers on both sides.

Finally, acording to the Instruction, when there is question of interdiocesan, national, or international conventions of Catholics and non-Catholics, special permission must be sought from the Holy See for each case. In the petition it must be stated what questions are to be discussed, and who are the proposed speakers. Before the permission of the Holy See has been secured, it is forbidden to Catholics to begin any external preparation or to collaborate with non-Catholics making such preparations.

Examples of the type of meeting visualized in this last ruling of the Instruction would be the "Conversations of Malines" inaugurated by Cardinal Mercier a quarter of a century ago, and the great assembly of Christian sects held in Amsterdam in 1948. It is interesting to note that the Instruction does not limit the participation of Catholics to meetings begun under Catholic auspices.

(4) Particular points and admonitions embrace: first, the approval of the recitation of a prayer by both Catholic and non-Catholic participants at the opening and close of a meeting, provided the prayer is one that is approved by the Catholic Church. The Instruction mentions explicitly the Lord's Prayer. This is merely an application of the principle, admitted by theologians, that Catholics may participate in *private* prayers with non-Catholics, as long as the prayers are orthodox. Thus, there is no objection to the recitation of the Our Father by Catholic and Protestant children in a public school, under the direction of a Catholic teacher.[8] But, the Instruction again warns against any *communicatio in sacris*—that is, participation in official or public worship with non-Catholics.

Secondly, the Instruction states, although each Ordinary has the task of taking charge of the movement toward "reunion" in his own diocese, it is suitable and even necessary to have the united efforts of a number of Bishops to set up measures for observing, investigating and directing the whole activity in this field. The Bishops, therefore, are to take common counsel as to how to secure uniformity and well-concerted action.

[8] Cf. Connell, *Morals in Politics and Professions* (Westminster, Md.: The Newman Bookshop, 1946), p. 157.

Thirdly, religious superiors are admonished to see that their subjects strictly and faithfully observe the directions of the Holy See and of the local Ordinaries in promoting the work of "reunion." It is very evident from this prescription that even the members of exempt religious societies may not conduct conferences or discussions of the type referred to in the *Monitum* without the permission of the Bishop. Their religious superiors can grant no permission of this kind.

It could be appropriately remarked here, although the Instruction does not mention it, that the local Ordinary may reserve to himself the right to authorize the participation of Catholics in even those meetings which do not come under the scope of the *Monitum* —for example, those whose stated purpose is the promotion of good will, or the procuring of "released time instruction" for public school children. Such meetings, though inaugurated for an end not comprised in the prohibition of the *Monitum*, might easily pass into assemblies requiring the permission of the Ordinary; hence, in prudence he could require that they be submitted to his judgment.

It is very evident that the Instruction makes no concession in the matter of doctrinal or moral principles previously held by the Catholic Church. On the contrary, it rather emphasizes those principles, and insists in detail on their observance by all Catholics. The Instruction states that there have been faults on the part of some Catholics in their manner of collaborating toward the "ecumenical movements," either because they did not follow correct principles or because they did not avoid dangers in pursuing their zealous designs. The same fact is implied in the statement made by the Secretary General of the World Council of Churches, Dr. W. A. Visser't Hooft, in Geneva: "The directive remains below the level reached by certain members of the Roman Catholic hierarchy."[9] And Rev. Marc Boegner, President of the same organization asserted that the Instruction is a step backward in the "ecumenical movement." "For," he said, "up to now there have been frequent contacts between Roman Catholic clergymen and laymen and those of the different Protestant faiths represented in the World Council of Churches. But the result of this decree seems to be that now no local ecumenic meetings, even

[9] Quoted in *Time*, March 13, 1950, p. 92.

among theologians alone, can take place without the formal authorization of a local bishop. The worst is that any meeting implying the presence of theologians or laymen from several dioceses will automatically require the formal approval of the Holy See." [10]

To most non-Catholics it is indeed a hard saying that the only type of "reunion" possible according to Catholic principles is that which includes the acceptance of the complete body of Catholic doctrines by those who wish to be united to the Catholic Church. The Anglican Archbishop of Canterbury, while praising the section of the Instruction which approves of co-operation between Catholics and non-Catholics in defending fundamental Christian principles, asserts of the Catholic notion of "reunion": "We have no thought or intention of reunion on such terms and mean something quite different by reunion." [11]

Priests must, therefore, be on their guard lest, in their zeal to bring the light of the true faith to those who are outside the Church, they compromise in any way the principles of Catholic doctrine. Above all, they must observe to the letter the directions laid down in the Instruction, in the matter of seeking ecclesiastical authorization for any meetings with non-Catholics for the purpose of discussing doctrinal differences, and if the local Ordinary has made some particular rulings, these must be obeyed most exactly.

To all Catholics the words regarding the work of "reunion" which terminate the letter should be a source of inspiration: "All indeed, but mainly priests and religious, must be admonished and encouraged to seek to fecundate and promote the work by their prayers and sacrifices. Finally, all must be made conscious of the fact that for those wandering outside the fold there is no more efficacious means of preparing the way to embrace the truth and the Church than the faith of Catholics associated with good moral conduct."

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
*The Catholic University of America*
*Washington, D. C.*

[10] Quoted in United Press dispatch, March 3, 1950.
[11] Quoted in *The Tablet*, March 11, 1950.

## HOW NEAR IS EVENING MASS?

The Holy Father's concession that this Holy Year of 1950 might, at the local bishop's option, be inaugurated by a special midnight Mass, cannot but raise in some quarters the question of the general restoration of post-noon Mass as a regular feature of Catholic life.

It would seem that German- and French-speaking Catholics are about psychologically ready now for post-noon Mass, weekdays and Sundays; that Polish- and Bohemian-speaking Catholics are just a step behind them; that Italian- and English-speaking Catholics are getting warmed up to the thought for Sundays; while Portuguese- and Spanish-speaking ones are still to be reached by the notion at all.

When Pope Pius XII addressed the consistory in the presence of the thirty-two newly-created cardinals, Feb. 20, 1946, he delivered a remarkable discourse, of which the final section dwelt with eloquence upon the social mission of the Mass in the modern world. His Holiness summed up: "The Church, then, provides in the Mass, Venerable Brethren, the greatest good of human society. Every day from where the sun rises to where it sets, without distinction of peoples or nations, there is offered a clean oblation, at which are present all children of the Church scattered throughout the world, and all here find a refuge in their needs."

One of those listening most attentatively there that day was Theodosio de Gouveia, Archbishop of Lourenco Marques, in Portuguese East Africa. "From where the sun rises to where it sets," he heard the Pope say very distinctly (*"da dove nasce il sole fin dove tramonta"*), giving a sharpened tone to the Vulgate reading. But Africa's new cardinal could reflect that the ordinary version of Malachy's words, *usque ad occasum,* could be translated "from *when* the sun rises to *when* it sets." He could recall, what every one knew, that there had been ample war-time "privileges" for afternoon and evening Mass. Cardinal Faulhaber, for instance, could have told him that in 1941 the papacy allowed the German bishops to have evening Mass, Sundays and week-days, as need dictated. Cardinal Spellman might also have informed him that in 1942 the Holy Father had acceded to his request that all the American armed forces should be allowed post-noon Mass, on

Sundays for those hindered from attending, on week-days without restriction. Cardinal Suhard could have told him that France had had such permission for its war-prisoners.

"After all," we may imagine Cardinal de Gouveia saying to himself, "if the Pope can grant war-time privileges, he can grant peace-time privileges, as pastoral need may suggest; for there is never any truce in Satan's war on us." So the next echo of the papal address that attracted wide attention in this regard was the announcement made at Lisbon two months later (April 21), by Cardinal de Gouveia, that Pope Pius XII was granting permission to have Sunday Mass in the afternoon in Portuguese East Africa, "because many native servants are not allowed out on Sunday mornings."

This statement, naturally, was given world-publicity. This will bear watching, people said, for it is not only in Portuguese East Africa that many are legitimately hindered from going to Mass on Sunday mornings.

Also present in consistory that day was Joseph Frings, Archbishop of the stately city on the Lower Rhine, Cologne. On his return home Cardinal Frings published a pastoral, which both echoed Pope Pius' words on the mission of the Mass, and reflected current war-time conditions in the fatherland: "Lift up your gaze, then, to the altar of sacrifice, on which Christ constantly renews in unbloody fashion His supreme Sacrifice of Golgotha, be this celebrated in the morning, or in the evening hours. Thence also descends the blessing of Almighty God, by reason of the merits of Jesus Christ, that you may be enabled in these trying times to work out your salvation, and attain the goal of eternal life" (March 11, 1946). What Cardinal de Gouveia was asking for Africa had already been given for Sundays and some weekdays, at episcopal option, in Germany. These three statements of February, March and April, 1946, may be taken as charting post-war developments in the restoration of the *sacrificium vespertinum.*

As our attention just now centers on Germany, we may briefly indicate how that country has now advanced, with full papal permission of course, farther than any other in Europe towards unrestricted evening Mass. To mention only sees where administrative statements have come to my notice, Aachen, Paderborn, Bamberg, Hildesheim, Osnabrück, have all found the evening Mass,

on week-days particularly, to be highly advantageous, as well as Cologne, Munich and Berlin. Mr. Richard Reid, editor of *The New York News,* describes a meeting of the Munich Midtown First Friday Club (a Morristown institution that has struck root abroad): "We had the privilege of attending the most recent meeting of the club, which has some unusual features. The club members attend Mass at 6:15 in the evening, and receive Communion. The meeting is, therefore, a supper, not a luncheon meeting . . ." (June 6, 1949). "On the Feast of Christ the King," writes Msgr. M. B. Hellriegel (Nov. 3, 1949), "I sang the High Mass at 6:00 p.m. (an every Sunday occurrence) at nearby Lorsch." Lorsch is in the Archdiocese of Mayence.

That not all Berlin priests are of their prelate's mind in viewing the evening Mass indult is indicated by a clerical directive there of Dec. 7, 1948: "If evening Mass produces good results, as undoubtedly is the case, no one should hesitate about celebrating it as widely as possible: in cities and industrial areas, especially, it ought to be celebrated every day. The clergy will be glad to open up to the faithful a new source of grace. As day begins with Mass, so the day can close with it. The holy Sacrifice at the close of the day is a climax towards which the work of the whole day is directed . . . Vigil service, especially the Holy Saturday liturgy, is much more meaningful in the evening." There is a movement in Germany for post-noon Mass *omnibus anni diebus,* as they put it. For the opening address of last year's great *Katholiken Tag* (Sept. 1, 1949) at Bochum, Rev. John B. Hirschmann, S.J., a Professor of Canon Law and Pastoral Theology, was invited to voice the plea, before 50,000 hearers, that this ardent wish of German Catholics for unrestricted evening Mass find quick fulfilment. One might mention here that Mr. Werner Maurenbrecher (147 Mörserstr., Krefeld) distributes from time to time printed bulletins of the progress of the evening Mass movement.

It would seem to be Austria's historic mission to furnish cultural leadership to the German peoples, without reaping much in immediate returns. In this connection it was a book published in Vienna in 1914 (F. Zimmerman, *Die Abendmesse in Geschichte und Gegenwart*) that gave the first impetus to this whole business of post-noon Mass. During the war years, as long as Austria was "part" of the German Reich, it also shared in the post-noon Mass

privileges accorded to the German bishops. Regretfully it saw this war-time grant cease to apply to its local churches. If it be permitted to quote a private letter from an Austrian Ordinary, under date of July 9, 1948, there were those who shared his sentiments: "I regard it as of the highest pastoral importance that this grant be again extended." Meanwhile, from Innsbruck, Fr. Jungmann's recent masterpiece on the history of the Mass had hailed the papal concession of evening Mass, as granted in Germany during the war, and had added his historian's comments upon the indults: "Nor is this something altogether new, even apart from the primitive Church, and from the great festivals. That the Easter and Pentecost service was held in the evening lasted well into the Middle Ages: also the Masses concluding the four Ember Weeks were held at night. In modern times an analogous custom in connection with the first Christmas Mass has spread widely from Venice."[1]

In the course of a conversation with Fr. Jungmann last August I heard him mention, with some surprise, that on his latest visit to Vienna he had found *one* church continuing the daily evening Mass. Why this one church, I wanted to ask him, but the conversation took a turn and the chance was missed. The explanation, doubtless, was that this church was serving the American Occupation Forces. The *Katholische Beobachter* for March 9, 1949, has a relevant Note From Vienna: "Monsignor-Lieutenant R. J. Nuwer [Diocese of Buffalo], ranking chaplain of the American Forces in Austria . . . has taken over the evening Mass in the old Holy Trinity Church (where Beethoven was once organist), in order to provide his countrymen with divine service. Little by little many Viennese began dropping in. . . . Every evening now crowds of local people attend. . . ." So some civilians in Vienna thus share in the evening Mass grant of the American Forces.

When this article had reached the stage of final typing, a postal, mailed October 15, 1949, brought this information, which I owe to Fr. Gerald Van Ackeren, S.J.: "You will be interested to know that daily evening Mass is celebrated for all the faithful at three churches in Vienna. They may also receive Communion at these evening Masses with a four-hour fast from solids, a one-hour fast from liquids. Sunday evening Mass is celebrated in eight, at least,

[1] J. A. Jungmann, *Missarum sollemnia* (Wien: Herder, 1948), I, 315.

of the churches of Vienna." So evening Mass, week-days and Sundays, circles the Ringstrasse.

The Austran bishops, we are led to believe, would be glad to secure a permanent indult for evening Mass, not only for Sundays and holydays, but for all days of any special devotion that are not civil holidays. Swiss Ordinaries, also, we are informed, are framing a request in this regard to be sent to Rome.

If Germany now leads Europe in the march towards evening Mass *omnibus anni diebus,* France must surely be the land where the post-noon Mass is most discussed. At the time Cardinal de Gouveia announced the permission accorded for Africa, France had known evening Mass for its war-prisoners, as, much more spectacularly, for its factory-priests in the *Mission de Paris* and the wider *Mission de France,* as well as, most spectacularly, on the occasion of great national conventions. Did not the greatest evening Mass in modern times take place at Lourdes, with Papal Legate Cardinal Pacelli pontificating at six o'clock of a Sunday evening for a throng of pilgrims estimated at three hundred thousand in the spring of 1935?

But to return to the spring of 1946. By then some one hundred thousand copies of Abbé Godin's amazing report to Cardinal Suhard had been sold, with evening Mass mentioned constantly.[2] The urban center is the special object of Godin's survey, but by 1945 Abbé Boulard's corresponding work on the rural areas had appeared.[3] More on the lay-level, perhaps, was the moving journal of the young Jesuit, Perrin, who had served as chaplain with the French labor battalions in Germany. Among his dreams for the future Perrin had written: "If we want the Mass to become the prayer of the Christian people once more, if we really want Christians to give the world the nourishment it needs, one way would be to go back to the Last Supper—the evening Mass. Only habit, or perhaps routine, could stop our realizing that it is an urgent need. It is not normal or right for Mass and Communion to become the special prerogative of those who have nothing to do—

[2] The best survey of all these French developments is M. Ward, *France Pagan?* (London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1949); a much less balanced description is C. H. Bishop's *France Alive* (New York: McMullen, 1947). Godin's famous report is *France pays de mission* (1943).

[3] F. Boulard, *Problèmes missionnaires de la France rurale* (1945). To the best of my knowledge this has not been translated.

old women, the well-to-do." [4] In 1946 itself was issued a still more sweeping challenge, on the missionary concept of a modern parish, by Abbé Michonneau.[5]

In the great pilgrimages held that summer in France there were evening, or nocturnal, Masses for the pilgrims. In connection with their large conventions there were afternoon Masses, dinner-hour Masses, evening Masses. For all of these there seems to have been permission specifically obtained. Priests were pressing Cardinal Suhard, and the other French Ordinaries, to get more and more concessions from Rome in the matter of times for Mass. "The evening Mass will answer all our problems," some priests were then saying. "The privileges we hope to obtain," replied the then Cardinal-Archbishop of Paris, "will in no way dispense priests from the efforts they must continue to make for the people. It is all very well to celebrate Mass in the evening, *provided* that we actually bring our people to it, that they understand its meaning, that they be induced to pray intensively" (Vanves, 1946).

At the end of that summer Cardinal Suhard published the fact that, on behalf of the entire hierarchy, the French Cardinals (four of whom had been elevated with Cardinal de Gouveia) were asking Rome for permission to celebrate evening Mass under certain circumstances (October 3). Soon the permissions began to be announced: that on behalf of prisoners (November 20); for midnight Mass in connection with celebrations, outings (November 22); and, twelve months later, permission for post-noon Masses on Sundays and holydays for workers hindered from attending morning Mass (Nov. 27, 1947). This is the De Gouveia reason, we recall. This grant was then on a one-year trial basis. Rome's latest authorization to France in this respect that has come to my notice is dated June 14, 1948, and liberalizes the conditions for nocturnal Mass on outings.[6] A current news-item recounts that Cardinal Spellman, passing through Paris, had been invited to inaugurate a series of Sunday evening Mass-television programs (Nov. 4, 1949).

[4] H. Perrin, *Journal d'un prêtre ouvrier en Allemagne* (1945) has appeared in English as *Priest-Workman in Germany* (London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1947). The passage quoted is from pp. 195-96.

[5] G. Michonneau, *Paroisse communauté missionnaire?* (1946); in English, *Revolution in a City Parish* (Blackfriars, 1949).

[6] Cf. *Ephemerides liturgicae*, LXIII, 1 (1949), 83.

France's neighbor to the north and close cultural ally, Belgium, was also quick to take advantage of post-noon Mass for many of its men on duty Sunday mornings. In this instance most elaborate care was taken to make Mass available for those legitimately hindered in the forenoon, and still make it impossible for others to take advantage of the change. The grant, dated Jan. 28, 1947, was originally a one-year grant: "The privilege of attending these post-noon Masses is limited to persons over twenty years of age who must work during the forenoon hours of Sundays and holydays. Others must abstain from assisting at these Masses or receiving Communion at them." [7] Put Belgium, also, in the De Gouveia column. Incidentally one might mention here that one of the best treatments of post-noon Mass as a pastoral necessity may be found from the pen of Dom Eloi Dekkers, monk of Steenbrugge, in the recent Commemorative Essays for Cunibert Mohlberg.[8]

"If you cannot meet by day, why, you have the night—*Si colligere interdiu non potes, habes noctem*" (*De fuga,* 14), Tertullian advised in the persecution he had known. In similar strain the Holy See now advises Poland, in the person of her primate, Cracow's Archbishop Sapieha, cardinal since 1946. A single-sentence dispatch in the *Freiburger Kirchenblatt* of Aug. 15, 1948, informs us: "Pope Pius XII has granted Polish priests permission to celebrate evening Mass, as a large part of the Polish workers would otherwise have no possible chance to attend divine service."

Blue may be the Danube where it passes Vienna Woods, but red, and redder runs the Moldau as it winds through ancient Prague. So Archbishop Joseph Beran (not then under house-arrest) and some one hundred thousand of his countrymen may well have scanned the sky as they gathered in the great square at Prague for Solemn Mass at 6:00 p.m. on the Feast of St. Wences-

[7] Citation quoted is the N.C.W.C. news dispatch, but checked with the original given in *Ephemerides liturgicae,* LXI, 1 (1947), from *Collationes Brugenses,* XLIII (1947), 143.

[8] E. Dekkers, "L'église ancienne a-t-elle connue la messe du soir?" *Miscellanea liturgica in honorem Cuniberti Mohlberg* (Rome, 1949), I, 231-57. The author here multiplies proofs that the very earliest Christian ages normally had Mass *ante lucem,* while the patristic period also had week-day Mass *sub vesperam diei.* What the author fails to bring out is that there was no week-day Mass in the first period.

laus (Sept. 28, 1947): "It will be stormy, for the sky is red and threatening." They may soon see their river redder.

We know from such works as *God's Underground*[9] that priest-prisoners in Russia and Hungary and Jugoslavia are amply supplied with papal grants for evening Mass. I should like to know if similar privileges have been obtained for such Catholics as may be at large in Hungary and Jugoslavia. In the Tito tyranny I should be interested also in any fresh information of the spread of a custom, radiating from Venice, whereby the first Christmas Mass is anticipated into the evening, or even the afternoon, of December 24th. The idea might not appeal to us at first hearing, but it is very popular in Dalmatia and Italy, and is growing. One may recall that early in the recent war an indult permitted an early "midnight" Mass where the black-out regulations were in force. For the Christmas Eve of 1948, *"per benigna concessione del Santo Padre,"* as the *Osservatore* put it, this custom was introduced into the Lateran Basilica, with Pontifical Masses scheduled for 4:00 and about 7:00 o'clock, and other Masses in between. The laity's fasting provision in this instance, also, was four hours' fast from solid food, one hour from liquids, which seems to be standard in these post-war grants.

It will complete our little list of Italian items to mention two more facts, both, like the foregoing, emanating from Rome. Following a policy going back some fifteen years, the International Council of the Apostolate of the Sea, meeting in Rome in October, 1948, asked its President, the Archbishop of Glasgow, to petition the Holy See for evening Mass privileges (and shortened Eucharistic fast) for seamen in all ports the world over. No reply has been published as yet. When this *Apostolatus Maris* meet was held at Rome, Romans were still talking about the *"notta santa,"* between Saturday and Sunday, Sept. 11-12, when some two hundred and fifty thousand Italian Catholic youths, boys and girls, assisted in a midnight Dialog Mass and received Communion from two thousand priests in the limitless Piazza of St. Peter's; "one of the greatest gatherings in all the history of religion," as one priest described it. So Rome encourages by Roman example afternoon Mass on Christmas Eve, and nocturnal Mass, satisfying the Sun-

[9] G. Palmer, *God's Underground* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, 1949).

day obligation, at great celebrations, while continuing to receive petitions for wider evening Mass indulgences throughout the world.

Of the Iberian lands there is little to relate. "The idea of evening Mass, as a pastoral project, has never, to my knowledge, been considered in modern Spain," a Spanish editor wrote me a couple of years ago. "In my travels and reading about Spain," said Angelo Cervera, S.J., to me recently, "I do not recall a single instance, apart from the Christmas midnight Mass, of any post-noon Mass, even in connection with a Eucharistic Congress." As far as my own information goes, the same applies to Portugal. With a remarkable fidelity to cultural patterns the same is true of Latin America as a whole. Mexico had evening Mass in the persecutions twenty years ago. Chile even had a continuous three-day sequence of Masses, in imitation of that Lourdes triduum which may be said to have launched the evening Mass in Europe, but there seems to have been no glimpse in Chile of those "most happy portents" which Pius XI envisaged for the Lourdes celebration (Jan 10, 1935). San Salvador, I am reliably informed by Joachim Lopez, S.J., has a growing custom of having a midnight Mass at the New Year. This is quite interesting, as evidence of another psychological starting point for the spread of post-noon Masses.

I have no proof that the Irish clergy are giving thought to the pastoral possibilities of afternoon and evening Masses for Ireland. Many of the callings that in other countries make Sunday morning Mass impossible do not have that consequence in Ireland itself —tramway and transport workers, journalists, hotel and domestic employees, and the like. But there is ample evidence that Irish priests are seriously considering, not to say debating, over what their clerical brethren in France are doing, evening Mass included, as any one who pages this year's issues of *The Irish Ecclesiastical Record* can attest.

Speaking for England Cardinal-Archbishop Griffin says: "It is still an open question whether the apostolate for the worker is more satisfactorily fulfilled by the priest's undertaking factory work." [10] As to the feasibility or desirability of afternoon or evening Mass, Sundays or week-days, for English Catholics, I have seen no recent episcopal statements. But priests are writing about it, and an occasional lay voice asks for it. Reverend David L. Greenstock, of

[10] B. Griffin, "Foreword," *France Pagan*.

the Diocese of Southwark, writing in *Clergy Review* (Oct. 1948), on the Sunday evening service, canvasses the entire problem as he sees it, and comes up with the query: "In our present difficulties, does not the evening Mass provide a reasonable solution?" How little this layman, J. M. Dale, appears to be asking for in his note to *The Catholic Herald* (Apr. 1, 1949): "There seems to be a strong case for an occasional evening Mass. There are large numbers of people who, in order to hear a Mass on a weekday, must first have breakfast and go to work direct from Mass. After all, the first Mass (i.e., the Last Supper) took place in the evening." Thus, Mass *circa vesperam diei,* its possibility for Sundays, its desirability also for week-days, is under discussion among Catholics of Great Britain.

Canada, too, is beginning to familiarize itself with the thought of post-noon Mass as a modern necessity. The Dominion had a gigantic Marian Congress (June 1947), the central feature of which was a continuous sequence of Masses through three days and nights—Our Lady of Lourdes calling in Canada, as it were. But the most striking manifestation of new thinking was the great nuns' Mass and Communion at midnight. If the nuns can come at midnight, why not the workers at 4:30, 5:30, 6:30, 7:30?

In the United States (where the Cardinal Spellman grant still operates in military circles) there was some lively discussion in the past year. A chapter of *The Mass of the Future* advocates evening Mass *on week-days.* That very chapter was singled out for condensation in *The Catholic Digest* (Nov. 1948), whereat the fat was in the fire. In the public discussion from the very outset no word was said about *week-day* post-noon Mass; all the stress was put on pleading for, or deprecating the very idea of, *Sunday* evening Mass. Under the circumstances a debt is owing to Rev. Justin J. Kane (Dubuque) for intervening to bring the discussion back to the idea of week-day evening Mass. "If they want to increase devotion and attendance at Mass," he asks, and who of us does not wish this?—"and the afternoon Mass is their answer, then let us work towards that end for week-days, when the 'world of work' is truly the obstacle."[11] But that also *ended* the debate. Aren't American priests interested in week-day afternoon and evening Mass?

[11] *Orate Fratres,* XXIII, 7 (May 15, 1949), 327.

Every priest must be saddened by the progressive secularization of Sunday evidenced all around us. What sharer in the sacred ministry in the United States would not say a fervent "Amen" to Pope Pius's plea (Sept. 7, 1947) for the restoration of Sunday:

> Sunday must again become the day of the Lord, the day of adoration, of glorification of God, of the Holy Sacrifice, of prayer, of rest, of recollection and reflection, the day of happy reunion in the intimate circle of the family. Sad experience has taught us, that, for not a few of those who devote themselves to honest work during the week, Sunday has become the day of sin.

The Pontiff would seem to be looking right into American homes all around us as he continues his plea:

> With all your strength, then, make sure that in your own lives crass materialism, an excess of profane pleasure, and the crudest moral corruption in the press and in the theatre does not monopolize the Sunday and thereby efface its divine character, enticing souls to sin and irreligion. Indeed, the result of the struggle between faith and incredulity will depend to a great extent on the use that each of the opposing fronts will make of Sunday; will it be stamped clearly and unmistakably with the holy Name of the Lord, or will that Name be profanely obscured and passed over? Here a vast field of activity awaits you. Go forth courageously to the work, and help give Sunday back to God, to the Church, to peace and the happiness of families.[12]

But when all our present forces shall have been mobilized for the reconquest of Sunday, it will still be true that without post-noon Mass we are not providing for a numerous, and growing, segment of Catholics prevented by work from attendance on Sunday mornings. Through the operation of the Cardinal Spellman grant, there were restricted post-noon Masses for military personnel, prevented from going in the forenoons, in many of our cities throughout the war. No single instance of any disorder, by reason of the restricted admittance, came to light. A similar peace-time grant, similarly restricted to those hindered by work on Sunday mornings, would afford those Catholics their share in the unsearchable riches of the Eucharistic Sacrifice.

One American Ordinary did secure (in 1948) an indult for his see in the matter of post-noon Masses. It followed the full De

[12] *AAS*, XXXIX (1947), 425-31; English version, *Catholic Mind*, XLV (Nov. 1947), 641-48.

Gouveia pattern, in being granted for one year only on a trial basis, in being limited to Sundays and holydays of obligation, in being limited only to those hindered from attendance in the forenoons, and it had the same 4-1 fasting regulation. But His Excellency has not wished any public announcement of the fact up to now.

But it is rather the vast, and all but inarticulate body of those lay people who would welcome the chance of attending evening Mass on week-days, that prompts one to second their plea. Here, too, we are not entirely without precedent in the United States of recent times: the Pueblo and Richmond jurisdictions had limited week-day evening Masses during the war years. The writer is old enough to recall how ardently many people yearned for daily Communion in the days before 1905, and with what a cry of joy the great decree was greeted. In many hearts today there wells the prayer thus phrased by Mary Perkins' *Mind the Baby:* "Please, if it be Your Will, give John a better schedule next year, and make me a little stronger, so that we can have our daily Bread again, and not only on Sundays—*or else do something soon about evening Masses!*" [13]

One could sum up this restoration of post-noon Mass by saying: "In 1914 a German-speaking author wrote about it; some twenty years afterwards, when people had grown up with the idea, his work achieved the first afternoon and evening Masses; ten years still later, under the impact of total war, the idea was spreading very rapidly in Germany and its nearest neighbors; farther off, as in Italy, Great Britain, the United States, the first ripples are being felt; and there are areas, Ireland, Australia and New Zealand, and the Iberian lands of both hemispheres, that still await the impulse."

But here enters a wholly new element, a new, and distant, source of radiation; a new—and papal—source of inspiration. The *pusillus grex* of Catholics in the vast regions of the Far East are getting their own working-man's indult of evening Mass.

My information here, reliable as far as it goes, is sketchy in the extreme. To begin with China: Archbishop Paul Yu-pin (Nanking) explained in *America* (Jan. 15, 1949) how Pius XII has come to the aid of the harassed Catholics there: "The Holy See has granted special permission for priests working in those parts

[13] M. Perkins, *Mind the Baby* (London and New York: Sheed and Ward, 1949), p. 113.

to celebrate Mass with ordinary bread, without altar or candles, without a missal and without vestments. . . . This means that Mass may be celebrated while the priest and the faithful are sitting around a table, as if for a simple breakfast." I imagined, on reading this, that the grant would also include permission to offer Mass at any time of the day. I asked Rev. E. T. Mannion, of Maryknoll, if he had positive information on this detail. He replied that he did not, but that such an extension would scarcely be necessary, as the missioner's usual *pagella* of faculties, at the Ordinary's option, already contained the faculty of celebrating Mass at any hour of the day, and even as a second Mass, and when not fasting, for any valid ministerial reasons.

The Catholics of Japan, such as survived Nagasaki and Hiroshima, were unofficially informed by the Holy See that, if they requested permission for post-noon Masses, the reply would be favorable. The request was submitted; the reply came back. As published in a Tokyo dispatch of June 19, 1948, the clergy were informed:

> Faculties have now been granted (decree of March 11, 1948) for a period of two years to all Mission Ordinaries in Japan to permit their clergy to say Mass after the noon-hour, in cases where the Christians are not able to attend in the morning. The Mass may not begin, however, later than 7:30 p.m. The Ordinaries are authorized at the same time to dispense from the Eucharistic fast in such wise that those wishing to receive Holy Communion may partake of food up to within four hours of the time of receiving the Sacrament, and may partake of non-alcoholic liquids up to within one hour of that time.[14]

A professor in St. Albert's Seminary, Ranchi, India, Francis Eelen, S. J., writes under date of June 17, 1949: "In a few dioceses of India concessions have also been granted lately for evening Mass with a corresponding relaxation of the Eucharistic fast. I expect more concessions of this sort will be granted in mission countries. . . ." Precise details are not given. It may well turn out that the new, and Asiatic variety of the working-man's indult of post-noon Mass is the fullest up to date.

"I have no blueprint for liturgical improvements," writes Father John LaFarge in *America* (Jan. 15, 1949), "and I am fearfully

[14] *Tosei* news dispatch, June 19, 1948.

incompetent to offer one. But I do believe that it is not necessarily a love of novelty, but a very necessary prudence and ordinary wisdom that would make us take some very active and radical measures to bring the Mass much closer to the people than it is at the present time. . . . Overcaution in dispensing the mysteries of the faith may be quite as much a form of imprudence as lack of caution. (Jansenism's grim warning is ever with us). . . . The Church Militant is the Church Resourceful, and her infinitely greatest resource is the Saviour being offered as living Victim in the Mass itself."

GERALD ELLARD, S.J.

*St. Mary's College*
*St. Mary's, Kansas*

---

FIFTY YEARS AGO

In the May, 1900, issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* the leading article is an anonymous study of several charming medieval English hymns in honor of Our Lady, taken from *Our Lady's Dower*, a work by Fr. Thomas Bridgett, C.SS.R. . . . Fr. A. MacDonald contributes an article entitled "The Sacramental Channels of Divine Grace," in which he defends the Thomistic opinion that the sacraments produce their effects as physical instrumental causes. . . . Continuing his series of articles on the wine required for the Holy Sacrifice, Fr. Mooney, of New York, explains the decrees of the Holy See permitting, when certain definite conditions are fulfilled, the fortifying of wine by the addition of grape alcohol. He also asserts that some commercial wines, such as sherry and port, are often fortified by the addition of alcohol made from some substance other than grapes. . . . In the solution of a marriage problem, Fr. A. Lehmkuhl, S.J., claims that a marriage contracted by two unbaptized persons, both of whom later receive baptism, could be dissolved by the Pope, as long as they have had no conjugal relations subsequent to baptism, since such a marriage could be ranked as *ratum non consummatum*. . . . Fr. Bernard Feeney points out what he regards as the necessary mental equipment for a priest who wishes to be an effective pulpit orator—knowledge, judgment, imagination, feeling, etc. . . . In the *Analecta* we find a letter of Pope Leo XIII to Fr. Coubé, S.J., commending weekly Holy Communion, the subject of a series of sermons which had been delivered at the Eucharistic Congress of Lourdes and published by Fr. Coubé. . . . There is an anonymous article on "Recent Bible Study," and a lengthy and flattering review of Fr. Gigot's *General Introduction to the Study of the Holy Scriptures*, which had just been published.

F.J.C.

## APOSTOLIC CONSECRATION TO MARY

In His infinite wisdom and goodness, God has granted miracles to the men of every age that they might comprehend directly something of His power and majesty. Moreover, He has adapted these miracles to the mentality of each age. To the fickle Israelites whom Moses led, He manifested His power in the parted waves of the Red Sea that rushed back upon the Egyptians, in the ominous thunder and lightning that enveloped the holy mountain of the law, and in the fearful opening of the earth that swallowed Core and his fellow rebels—all terrible manifestations calculated to strike fear into a "stiff-necked" race. To the temporal-minded Jews of His own days upon earth, our Lord granted numerous cures of the body, multiplication of food for the body, resurrections of the body from death. To the barbarians of the "Dark Ages," God granted the great mountain-moving prodigies of many wonder-workers. And to modern men—has God also granted us the kind of miracle that most appeals to our twentieth-century mentality?

Fatima's is certainly such a miracle. It appeals most powerfully to our basic love of the spectacular. In fact, the Fatima miracle is only a spectacle and no more. Unlike the miracles of Moses it did not strike down God's enemies; unlike the miracles of Christ, it did not minister to men's bodies; unlike the miracles of wonder-workers like St. Anthony of Padua, it did not make nature more useful to man. It served no useful purpose whatever, other than to be a sign.

The message of Fatima, of course, contained no new doctrine beyond the revelation of Christ, but it held forth a challenge and an urgent appeal that was meant specifically for the materialistic age to which its miracle was so well adapted. As apostles of our own generation, we would be neglecting a most valuable gift of Providence were we to make no use of Fatima to raise our people Godward.

But Fatima, the great sign of Mary, can be misunderstood. For instance, an only too typical reaction was voiced by an American leader in Catholic Action who said that Mary's call has been to contemplation, whereas the Pope's call has been to action—Catholic Action. An excellent observation—except for the *whereas* which

sets up a contrast of opposition. Such an opposition between contemplation and action would have been unintelligible to St. Thomas Aquinas, for, according to his concept, contemplation springs into action and action disposes for contemplation. Perhaps men no longer conceive the same kind of action as did St. Thomas, immersed as they are in such an incessant round of duties that the choice seems to be between total activity and total passivity, instead of the complementary balance that God evidently intended by the very nature He gave man and the relations He established between nature and grace.

At any rate, it would be a mistake to think of Mary's Fatima message as a call to Christian men to desert their social responsibilities, retire into solitude, and engage only in prayer and sacrifice. Yet even if the Fatima message were limited to prayer and sacrifice, it should be observed that these two characteristic of purely contemplative life may both have a social orientation and surely do in the Fatima message. The prayer and the sacrifice requested at Fatima were asked for the conversion of sinners in general and of Russia in particular. And certainly, the severe expenditure of even physical energy in the work of the apostolate is a sacrifice *par excellence*. Why must this sacrifice be excluded from the thoughts of those who would call Fatima contemplative as though to set it at variance with the papal injunctions to action?

Moreover, besides prayer and sacrifice there is a third element in the Fatima message—consecration. This element can hardly be thought of as purely contemplative. What man ever consecrated himself to a cause only to think about it? The consecration asked at Fatima is a consecration to the Immaculate Heart of Mary; it must therefore be a self-dedication to the desire of this Immaculate Heart that all men might be saved in Christ. Such a dedication must embrace one's whole being—the mind to contemplate this Heart and its desire, the body to act for the fulfillment of that desire. If this dedication is sincere and whole-hearted, it must eventually spring into action—not any kind of action, but action directed by contemplation and returning again to contemplation for re-inforcement and ultimate repose in God.

That the consecration to Mary produces apostolic action as well as contemplation can be proved historically. Exactly one hundred years before the Fatima miracle, even to the month, the saintly Fr.

Chaminade, apostolic missionary to France after the Revolution, founded a religious congregation which he consecrated entirely to Mary *because* he wanted it to be intensely active. The members of this Society of Mary, known as Marianists, were granted the privilege of making their very profession of religious vows as a consecration to Mary for the glory of God. The fact that such a consecration has proved vital enough in our modern America to unite priests, teaching brothers, and working brothers in harmonious social equality and intense apostolic activity is attested by the celebration of the Marianists' American Centennial.

Fr. Chaminade, whose virtues will probably be declared heroic this year, the centennial of his death, based his Society upon consecration to Mary because he was convinced that men could not be won to Christ except through Mary. A study of his reasons for holding this conviction should help toward an understanding of Fatima's apostolic implications and therefore its relation to Catholic Action.

After the French Revolution, the France that had once been the pride of the Church was but a smouldering spiritual ruin. A century of Voltaire's proud rationalism and Rousseau's sensual naturalism had finally erupted into violent revolution of more than a form of government; it was a revolution of the whole spirit of a people. That change in spirit, very much like the degeneration besetting our own world-war era, was symbolized by the enthronement of the "goddess of reason." Toward faith in God there was left only cold indifference, an even more terrible thing than the heated controversy of the so-called Reformation.

Fr. Chaminade in a letter to retreat masters, Aug. 24, 1839, thus described the situation:

> In our day the prevailing great heresy is religious indifference which is casting on souls of the deadly sleep of selfishness and the blight of passion. The depths of the infernal abyss vomit forth dense clouds of black and pestilential smoke that threaten to envelop the whole earth in a dark night, void of good, full of all evil, and impenetrable, we might say, to the life-giving rays of the Sun of Justice. Consequently the divine light of faith is growing dim and being extinguished in the very midst of the Christian world; virtue is . . . disappearing, whilst vice is breaking loose with frightful fury. It seems that we are about to see what has been foretold, a general defection and an apostasy all but universal.

Have not we of the twentieth century actually seen this apostasy, at least in our secularized public life? We need merely open our eyes to the world about us to see the same lust for passing pleasure, the same indifference to eternal realities.

Chaminade opposed these results of the materialistic revolution by launching a *spiritual* revolution. It was obvious to him that the universal spirit of natural reason, which had trampled even reason itself, must be overturned by a new universal spirit of supernatural faith—a veritable conflagration of faith that would burn its way into the hearts of men and there burst into the red flame of charity.

But how could he give these men the very thing they had rejected? They had no foundation left upon which to build. By deliberately substituting the light of natural emotion for that of supernatural faith and the flame of human love for that of divine charity, they had limited themselves to a feeble candle that could reach nothing divine. Thus they had made God inaccessible and had put beyond their reach even the God-Man Christ, the only Mediator who could bring them to God. Repelled even by His claim to divinity, they closed their eyes to Christ and missed the charm of His humanity that should otherwise have attracted them. Consequently, the religious indifference which Chaminade had recognized as the great heresy of the age had taken firm root.

But Chaminade was confident that there was a way to break through this indifference. If he could not turn men's eyes to God or to Christ, he could at least turn them to Mary, God's purely human reflection. St. Bernard, whom Fr. Chaminade often quoted, had said:

> You fear, O men, to go to the Father; you tremble at the mere sound of His voice. . . . But then you have Jesus, the divine Mediator. . . . And still you dread to go to this divine Mediator. Although He became your brother and like unto you in the flesh . . . His infinite majesty frightens you. . . . Very well, then, go to Mary. She is purely human.[1]

Chaminade would now tell men who had blinded themselves to divinity to look upon Mary. Their purely human gaze and purely human poetry could still reach her human beauty, however inadequately—yet, Chaminade hoped with sufficient adequacy to win

[1] Cf. *Our Knowledge of Mary*, by John B. Fontaine, S.M. (Kirkwood: Maryhurst Normal Press, 1930), pp. 63 f.

their hearts from the narrow self-love that restricted them to their own human vision. According to his way of thinking, "The scepter of God's mercy seems to have been placed into her hands by her divine Son. . . . Religious hatred and indifference assault her in vain; she will triumph over these today, as she has so gloriously triumphed over them in the past."[2] And her triumph will be one of love and goodness, disposing men to respond again to the divine love of Goodness Himself, her Son.

Chaminade was confident, then, that if he could but lead men to Mary, they would find in this humble Handmaid, declared blessed for having believed, the humility they needed to abandon their rationalism and open their souls to faith. In this Immaculate Virgin they would find the purity and spiritual strength to abandon naturalism and control their craving for pleasure. Thus, in realistic harmony with their human nature, they would almost instinctively imitate her whose spiritual beauty they could still find humanly attractive.

But she herself is only a human reproduction, a faithful Mirror of her own Son Jesus:

> At the same time that Jesus Christ was conceived in her chaste womb according to the flesh, He was also conceived in her beautiful soul by the operation of the Spirit of Jesus Christ, the same Holy Spirit sent by Him to operate in her all His Mysteries of annihilation, and to make her not only conformable to Him, but uniform in sentiment.[3]

Hence, in imitating her, men would begin to resemble Christ Himself. And this imitation of Mary must essentially consist in following her gaze to Him whose beauty she constantly ponders in her heart. Like the first wise men, they would find the true source of wisdom and happiness in her arms—the revelation of God that is Christ. In this way, Chaminade hoped to lead men to Christ through Mary.

Moreover, the greater their love for Mary became, the greater would become their resemblance to Christ, who loved her best of all. Of course, such natural love that a man can give of himself is not supernatural charity. With the supernatural aid of actual grace, however, it can serve to dispose the man who gives this nat-

[2] Cf. *ibid.*, p. 5.
[3] William Joseph Chaminade, *Manual of Direction* (1829), p. 5.

ural love to receive sanctifying grace. And when that grace is given him, his love for Mary is made new. It is now *filial,* for he has truly become Mary's spiritual son. This filial love for Mary is a supernatural participation in Christ's own love, not merely an external imitation of Christ but an inner conformity with Him; for the only filial love that can be tendered Mary is the love of her only Son, Jesus. And the more a man loves Mary as his Mother, the more Christ in him is loving her—the more Christ's Mystical Body is growing in love. Ultimately, of course, this filial love is charity; for Mary exists only for God and in reference to Him, and Christ loves her as the image of His Father.

In brief, then, the natural man can be truly advanced toward God by the love that Mary elicits from him as a disposing of his being, a preparing of his heart, a humbling of his spirit for the Holy Spirit's infusion of the supernatural life of grace that actually conforms him to Christ in the sight of God.

And not only does Mary prepare the natural man morally and psychologically for the infusion of this supernatural life; she wins it for him. Christ has wrought our salvation and merited all graces for us, but He has chosen to distribute these graces to us through the Mediatrix whose prayers, because she is His Mother, unfailingly win His favor. And for whom does Mary pray more than for the purely natural man, the man who lacks the supernatural life that would make him her *living* son? She is in labor until Christ be formed in him, according to Fr. Chaminade's application of St. Paul's powerful expression.

When Mary has brought forth this new spiritual son, she has given birth to "another Christ." In so far as he is truly her son and realizes his spiritual sonship as a conformity with Christ, he participates in Christ's work of redemption. For Christ associates others in His work of redemption, first His own Mother as His New Eve, and then all her spiritual children. The new son of Mary, then, in so far as he realizes his sonship, shares her mission by becoming an apostle to win other men to Christ through her.

And now as an apostle he needs Mary more than ever. His work, as a participation in Christ's redemptive action, is primarily her mission as co-Redemptrix, entrusted to her from all eternity and announced at the dawn of human history in the prophecy of the Woman who will crush Satan's head. According to a thought of

St. Augustine very dear to Fr. Chaminade, it is her mission not only to give birth to Christ's natural Body and nourish His physical growth, but also to give birth to His Mystical Body and nourish its spiritual growth. An apostle who fosters the growth of this Mystical Body is therefore sharing in the mission that belongs primarily to Mary, whether he realizes it or not.

If he does realize it, however, he is that much better disposed to be a true instrument of redemption. Safeguarded from the pride of considering this mission as *his,* he is prepared to spend himself humbly in Mary's service for the glory of God. And when trials assail him and his works are disappointingly sterile of results, he needs the confidence and comfort that Mary can win for him from the Holy Spirit. After all, it is her work that he is doing, and if he serves her faithfully, according to the directions of his providential superiors, he need not worry about results—they are in her hands. Thus, whether he succeds or fails, he works on with a lowly magnanimity that nothing can shake.

Moreover, since Mary's mission is to nourish the growth of the Mystical Body, it is also her work to form Christ anew in its apostles. As Queen of Apostles and Mediatrix of all graces, she intercedes for the new apostle and distributes to him all the great apostolic graces that he needs—the strong faith, hope, and charity that sustain and fructify his work; the simplicity and kindness of her own mother-heart, so necessary for winning others; the strong patience, courage, generosity, and sacrifice of her sorrow-pierced heart, so necessary for bearing the saving cross of redemption. Above all, she initiates him, through her example and her intercessory aid, into the sublime mysteries of mental prayer, which Fr. Chaminade called the "proximate cause of zeal," fundamentally a union with God which faintly reflects Mary's own fruitful union with her Son, itself a shadow of the eternal fruitfulness of the Father's contemplation.

But she can do all this only for the apostle who puts himself entirely at her disposal. Without this entire submission to Mary, the apostle does not allow her to complete her work of forming Christ in him—a work that God has reserved to her in the order He has established for the salvation of mankind. That is why Fr. Chaminade considered total consecration to Mary a real necessity for a true apostle.

The new apostle makes his total consecration a living reality by studying Mary, honoring her, loving her, imitating her, and above all participating in her mission of bringing men to Christ by acquainting them with Mary herself. Attracted through her to Christ, these men, too, soon become new apostles. This perpetual motion of love from apostle to new apostles was what Fr. Chaminade called "multiplication of Christians." And this process, founded solidly on consecration to Mary, was his hope for the eventual salvation of all mankind.

It will be noted that this concept of "multiplication" corresponds to modern Catholic Action. And like Catholic Action, Chaminade's apostolate was organized under the hierarchy. To make true apostles out of his young disciples, he organized them into a sodality which "multiplied" so rapidly that within a few years he split it into sections of specialized groups that initiated and carried on practically every good work in Bordeaux, according to the testimony of the archbishop. This sodality, with its branches in surrounding towns, was the fulfillment of Fr. Chaminade's conviction:

> In the epoch of revival in which we live, the Church demands something more from her children than mutual edification. She wishes that all in unison second the zeal of her ministers and, directed by their prudence, work for her advancement. This is the spirit that has been imparted to the new sodalities; each sodalist is a permanent missionary, and each sodality is a continual mission.[4]

To foster this active zeal and make sure that "the new sodalities are not only sodalities *in honor* of the most holy Virgin, but constitute a *militia* which advances *in the name* of Mary,"[5] Chaminade enlisted the devoted service of a special group of sodalists who formed the very core of the work. Called the "State" to emphasize the fact that they were actually living in a state of life requiring apostolic activity, these "sodalist-religious" considered "their act of consecration to the Blessed Virgin . . . as an expression of profession."[6] Like the members of modern secular institutes, though living in the world they bound themselves by vows, the most important of which was the vow of zeal requiring stability in the sodality and generous active participation in its apostolate.

[4] MS "Answers to Difficulties" (1824).
[5] *Ibid.*
[6] "Pamphlet F" (probably written about 1810).

But from his thorough understanding of the modern world situation and probably from a private revelation granted him at the shrine of Our Lady of the Pillar in Saragossa, Fr. Chaminade knew that something more was needed. The sodality with its core of vowed leaders could convert individuals, could even, like modern Catholic Action, begin the restoration of the social order to Christ. But it could not furnish the full-scale intensity that would finally accomplish that restoration in its highest perfection by regenerating the total Christianity of the primitive community of the Church. For this he needed men and women so *totally* consecrated to Mary that they might form communities, one for men (the Society of Mary) and the other for women (the Daughters of Mary), living in such harmonious charity and working with such generous zeal as to present to the world an example and a powerful instrument for full Christianity in the whole social order. He explained his purpose to Pope Gregory XVI in a letter dated Sept. 16, 1838:

> To oppose a powerful barrier to the torrent of evil [impiety, modern rationalism, Protestantism] Heaven inspired me to . . . renew or rekindle everywhere the divine torch of the Faith, by presenting on all sides to the astonished world imposing masses of Catholic Christians of all ages, both sexes, and every walk of life, who, united in special associations, would practice our holy religion without vanity and without human respect in all the purity of its dogma and of its moral teaching. . . . But this means, entirely excellent as it is, did not suffice. . . . I thought it necessary before God to found two new religious institutes which would . . . prove to the world by example that the Gospel is as practicable today as it was eighteen hundreds years ago and would enter the field of education against the hidden forces of propaganda.

The motive, then, that inspired Fr. Chaminade to found religious institutes based upon consecration to Mary was zeal for souls. The whole human family must be brought back to Christ, even to fullest faith in Him and deepest love for Him, through Mary, the Mother of that family. For Mary is the Woman whom God made for a purpose, and to miss that purpose is to risk missing Christ Himself. Just as He chose to come to us through her, we must make our approach to Him through her. Without her—at least, without her mediation as God has willed it—we are graceless creatures, blinded to the charm of Christ's humanity by the forbidding splendor of His divinity. But in her company, seeing first the "humanized" reflec-

tion of His beauty in her, our dim eyes grow accustomed to goodness, until at last they can gaze lovingly upon the full splendor of Christ Himself, who with the Holy Spirit will lead us to the Father. To give Mary apostles who would co-operate in her mission of bringing back to Christ not only individuals but the very social order itself, Chaminade recruited sodalists consecrated to her by promise, "sodalist-religious" consecrated by vow and finally totally consecrated religious, living a community life like that of the primitive Church by uniting harmoniously all categories of apostles—priests, teaching brothers, and working brothers.

Thus, the Marianists, having now taken their place among the century-old American institutes, stand as a living testimonial to the power of consecration to Mary for the active apostolate, refuting by their continued existence and activity the contention that Mary's is a call only to contemplation and therefore that Fatima is opposed to the active life. The ideal of the Marianists as here set forth clearly indicates that consecration to Mary involves a contemplation which springs into action, forming a perfect balance between these two complementary, not opposed, forms of Christian life.

Fr. Chaminade saw the necessity of this consecration for the apostolate a hundred years before the Fatima message. Shall we who have been blessed with this new message, and with the miraculous seal that forms a perfect approach to the modern materialistic mind, overlook its importance for Catholic Action ?

ROBERT KNOPP, S.M.

*William Cullen McBride High School*
*St. Louis, Missouri*

---

MISSION INTENTION

The Holy Father's Mission Intention for the month of May, 1950, is directed towards "Social Problems in India."

# "AMERICANISM" REVIEWED BY ABBE FELIX KLEIN

The publication of the autobiographical volume of Abbé Felix Klein this year under the title of *L'Américanisme, Une Hérésie Fantome* (Paris: Librairie Plon, 1949) gives us a new account of the most notable controversy in American Catholic history. Klein was unwittingly at the center of the controversy and takes this opportunity to review the whole affair and with great satisfaction to make the charges of heresy ridiculous. The controversy has two distinct phases, the story of the controversy in France and the strange adaptation of that controversy in this country.

There were certain tendencies in Catholicism in the United States which laid the foundation for the controversy in this country. These tendencies manifested a certain progressiveness which could properly be called the real Americanism. Its manifestations could probably be seen in the defense of the Knights of Labor, in the attempts to work out a solution of the Catholic school question, in the exchange of civilities with non-Catholics in the World Congress of Religions in 1893, in the condemnation of Cahenslyism and in the general policy of Americanization under the direction of Cardinal Gibbons and Archbishop John Ireland. The "progressive" group of American bishops, led chiefly by Archbishop Ireland and Bishop John Keane, the first rector of the Catholic University, and their friends, were filled with optimism about the future of Catholicism in the United States. Nowhere was this optimism better expressed than in the publications of Archbishop Ireland when he spoke of "The Future of Catholics in America" and on "The Church and the Age." For him, not only was the American ideal the highest ever proposed but it would attain its fullest glory when America had become Catholic. Already Catholicism was making great strides along this path and it was necessary that the Church abandon its old ways of defensive action, go into the outside world, enter into the social and economic problems of the day and show that there was no conflict between democracy and religion or between science and the Church.

But Archbishop Ireland and the Americanizing prelates had built up a veritable army of opposition and this opposition extended

beyond the seas to Rome itself. In this country the German bishops did not take too well the rejection of the Memorials of Peter Paul Cahensly, asking for greater German membership in the American hierarchy, and the German press kept up a constant attack on all measures of Americanization. They were joined by Archbishop Michael Corrigan and his guide and protector, Bishop Bernard McQuaid of Rochester, and by Bishop Richard Gilmour and his successor Bishop Ignatius Horstman of Cleveland, who opposed Ireland in the school question and in certain political affairs. In Rome these more conservative prelates had friends in Fr. Salvatore Brandi, S.J., editor of the *Civilta Cattolica,* Cardinal Camillo Mazzella, S.J., both of whom had lived for some time in the United States, and in Cardinal Francesco Satolli, the former Apostolic Delegate to the United States, who had once been friendly to Ireland but who had returned to Rome with feelings described as unfriendly to the "progressive" bishops. A series of events brought the two groups into conflict in the last decade of the century. Two leaders of the German groups in this country were Fr. Joseph Pohle and Fr. Joseph Schroeder, two German theologians whom Keane had recruited for the first faculty of the Catholic University. In 1894 Pohle had announced his resignation and his return to Germany in a letter accusing the University of American intolerance and of heretical ideas. Schroeder remained but continued to criticize the American bishops. In 1896 the Holy Father, Pope Leo XIII, sent a letter announcing that according to the custom in papal universities Keane's term as rector of the Catholic University should be terminated and a new rector appointed. Keane accepted the letter with great humility and refused at first the offer of an office of honor in Rome. But the enemies of Ireland and Keane began to boast that the letter of the Pope was really a form of criticism of the progressives, and there were rumors that Ireland would next be called upon to resign his see. So persistent was this rumor that Cardinal Mariano Rampolla, the papal Secretary of State, was forced to deny that the Holy Father had any intention of asking for Ireland's resignation.

In the meantime, two other departures of note took place from the University. Abbé George Peries, a canon law professor closely associated with Pohle and Schroeder in their opposition to Keane and Ireland, had sent a threatening letter to Bishop Horstman and

the episcopal committee of the University should they dare to make any charges against him. The bishops immediately demanded his resignation. He returned to France, where he furnished newspapers with accounts unfriendly to Archbishop Ireland and Keane. Subsequently the bishops demanded the resignation of Dr. Schroeder. He demurred and obtained support for his cause in Rome, but the bishops refused to change their decision and he went back to Germany where he was received with honor.

During all this time there was available in the bookstores of this country a biography of Fr. Isaac Hecker, the founder of the Congregation of St. Paul, or the Paulists, by Father Walter Elliot, C.S.P., published in 1891. Although it had the *imprimatur* of Archbishop Corrigan and an introduction by Archbishop Ireland it received no unusual attention in this country. In France, however, it had attracted the attention of Count de Chabrol, who had visited the country in 1867-68 and had met Fr. Hecker. Count de Chabrol had admired greatly both the new country and the saintly Paulist. He was delighted with the biography and suggested to the publisher LeCoffre that it be published in a translation which his friend, Mlle. de Guèrines, of Clermont-Ferrand, had prepared at his request. The publisher agreed to examine the manuscript and sent it to a young clergyman consultor for the firm, Abbé Felix Klein, for his opinion. That was in the early part of 1897.

Klein liked the book and suggested that the translation be improved, some excessive verbiage be taken out and some phrases be replaced with phrases more suitable for the French public. He was too busy at that time to make these changes himself but when the publisher threatened to drop the book, Chabrol and M. Paul Thureau-Dangin persuaded him to undertake the task. The book also needed a preface, since Ireland's introduction was for American readers and Klein prepared a preface of about thirty-five pages. In those pages he pointed out the salient character of Hecker, his spiritual doctrines and his new messages for the modern world. He compared Hecker to Lincoln, yet quoted praise for his spirituality from Pius IX, Archbishop Ireland and Cardinal Newman. He compared Hecker's journal to the Confessions of St. Augustine and the writings of St. Teresa. Further he called him a doctor, a leader, in the new paths which the faithful were called to tread.

Klein said Hecker's Americanism was really not exclusively American. Hecker had recognized the new state of the human mind

in the modern world and had found in his Catholicism the answer to all these new higher propensities of the human mind. Hecker had found the modern solution in the submission of the individual soul to the Holy Spirit. While warning the faithful that there was no difference between the interior direction of the Holy Ghost and the external guidance in the Church, Hecker stressed this individual guidance and liberty. He had praised the Anglo-Saxon adherence to interior virtues. He explained the defeats of Catholicism in southern Europe by their adherence to the defensive ways of the sixteenth century. Instead of the passive virtues of that defensive period there was need of active virtues. "Our age is not an age of martyrdom, nor an age of hermits, nor a monastic age.... Our age lives in its busy marts, in counting rooms, in workshops, in homes, and in the varied relations that form human society, and it is into these that sanctity is to be introduced." "In Father Hecker," Klein said, "we have not merely a man of our own time but a man of the future." The preface was dated June 5, 1897, the vigil of Pentecost. Shortly after the appearance of the translation an essay by Count de Chabrol, "Un Prêtre américain, le Révérend Père Hecker," although already written before the publication, appeared in the *Correspondent* of May 25 and June 10. The book sold quickly and before long a second edition was issued. Within a short time there had been seven editions of the French biography.

The comments on the book were generally friendly. Laudatory reviews appeared in the *Journal des Débats* and *Temps*. *L'Univers* and even German publications praised the book. Then in August, 1897, during the Fourth International Congress of Catholic intellectuals at Fribourg, from Aug. 16 to the 20th, at the ninth session Monsignor Denis O'Connell spoke of Fr. Hecker, praising him for his Americanism. Bishop Turinaz of Nancy had been unable to hear the paper but arriving later at the same session he proceeded to attack the character of Fr. Hecker, charging that he was trying to introduce Protestant ideas into the Church. Abbé Klein felt impelled then to defend Fr. Hecker and to point out that the heresies charged against Hecker, particularly that he believed in the direct submission of the soul to the Holy Ghost, did not constitute the real meaning of Fr. Hecker's teaching. O'Connell's paper was intended to clear Hecker's name from certain false notions that had begun to be attached to him by some reviewers of

the French biography. He distinguished two kinds of Americanism, one which concerned political affairs, and in this O'Connell praised the ideals of the Declaration of Independence and the Constitution. The other was ecclesiastical, and concerning that Americanism O'Connell pointed out the liberty of the Church in the United States as compared to the enslavement of the Church in countries where Church and State were united.

It so happened that there had been a controversy going on in France for sometime concerning the proper relations of the Church to the French Republic. Pope Leo XIII in his letter to the French bishops, *Au milieu des sollicitudes,* in February, 1892, had given support to those who favored greater co-operation with the Republic. That same year Archbishop Ireland, coming directly from Pope Leo, had spoken in Paris in June praising the growth of the Church in democratic United States and urging greater co-operation by the Church with the spirit of the age. Thus the word "Americanism" had already acquired a meaning unfriendly to the more conservative members of the French hierarchy and clergy, and it was not long before this group began a full scale attack on the life of Hecker and the errors of Americanism. In the van of this attack was the ex-professor, Abbé Peries, writing under the name of St. Clement, and Abbé Charles Maignen, a priest of the Congregation of the Brothers of St. Vincent De Paul, who had fought the progressive French Catholics, especially Count De Mun, under the name of Martel. The articles appeared in the conservative journal, *La Vérité Francaise,* in the spring of 1898.

In the meantime, Abbé Klein had been told by his friend, M. Ollé-Laprune, that Père Coubé, S.J., would preach at the Church of Saint-Sulpice on Sunday, Nov. 7, 1897, on a subject that would be of interest. After speaking of St. Charles Borromeo the speaker attacked four groups of persons who seemed to endanger the Church. They were: those American bishops who had participated in the Parliament of Religions at Chicago, those who had accepted the article of M. Brunetière on the failure of science, M. George Blondel, who advocated a new apologetics, and Fr. Hecker with his Americanism. The following Sunday, Père Gaudeau, S.J., preached a similar attack in the Church of Saint-Clotilde. The next Sunday, Nov. 21, another Jesuit attacked the same errors in

Sacré Coeur. The controversy began to occupy space in religious periodicals in France, Belgium, Switzerland, and even Rome.

When the series of articles in *La Vérité* had been completed they were gathered into book form and published under the title, *Le Père Hecker est-il un Saint?* The book was divided into four campaigns. The first two included the Parliament of Religions in Chicago and the attempt by Abbé Charbonnel to have a second congress in Paris in 1900. Charbonnel left the Church when permission for this second congress was refused, proclaiming himself an "Americanist." The third campaign was the publication of the life of Hecker. The fourth campaign was entitled "Under the Walls of Rome." The book was based only partly on the biography of Hecker. It used Klein's preface, some other writings of Klein, a few passages from the writings of Ireland, Keane and O'Connell, the writings of Charbonnel and added useful passages from the French version of the biography, which thus acquired a meaning at variance with the ideals of Fr. Hecker. Maignen was attacking the democratic clergy. He accused them of proposing a new apologetics which would limit external submission to the Church, of advocating a dangerous liberalism in dealing with non-Catholics, of proposing a complete separation of Church and State, of opposing the practice of evangelical virtues and the vows of religious orders and of preferring the active virtues over the passive and natural virtues over supernatural virtues. Failing to get an *imprimatur* for his book from the Cardinal Archbishop of Paris, Maignen obtained it from the Master of the Sacred Palace, Fr. Albert Lepidi, O.P.

Abbé Klein was taken ill at this time and consequently did not answer his critics and, he tells us, when he began to recover his friends entreated him not to lower himself to the level of his attackers by making an answer. The controversy was getting so intense that Cardinal Richard of Paris wrote to Klein asking him not to issue any new editions of the biography. Archbishop Keane and Cardinal Gibbons protested to Pope Leo XIII the granting of the *imprimatur* to the book by the Master of the Sacred Palace but do not seem to have effected too much, except with Cardinal Rampolla, who was their friend. The next move of the conservatives was to send the biography to the Congregation of the Index to have it placed on the Index of Forbidden Books.

In the meantime the controversy in France raged hotter and

hotter. Abbé Klein, in his autobiography, notes that the word Americanism in the conservative press began to mean every kind of radical doctrine. The liberal press, such as the *Correspondent*, answered in kind. In Belgium, Père A. J. Delattre, S.J., published an attack entitled *Un Catholicism Américain* and finally Fr. Hyppolite Martin, the Jesuit Superior General, published an attack in *Études Religieuses* on July 20, 1898. Abbé Klein notes that Fr. Martin was a Spaniard and felt bitterly the effect of the Spanish-American War. In Rome Fr. Salvatore Brandi, S.J., published *Americanismo, riposta a un articulo dell' "Opinione" sul P. Hecker*, in which he criticized *Opinione* and other liberal papers of Rome for their favorable comments on the life of Fr. Hecker. Maignen's book was translated into English but could not find an American firm to publish it. It was printed in England and offered for sale by Arthur Preuss of the *Review* of St. Louis, who had been a constant critic of Ireland and the Americanization programs.

The controversy had become so bitter that the Holy Father appointed a commission to study the matter. The commission was headed by Cardinals Satolli and Mazzella, who had been in America but who were known to be unfriendly to the progressive group of bishops. Brandi's pamphlet had indicated that a condemnation of the doctrines could be expected. Soon similar word reached the United States. This news came as a surprise to Archbishop Ireland, who had been assured of the contrary, and he hastened to Rome. Cardinal Gibbons sent a cablegram to Rome protesting any condemnation, but the message arrived too late. The Cardinals had given the Pope an unfavorable report. The Holy Father took their report under consideration and softened it sufficiently to indicate that the doctrines were not attributed to any actual persons and issued it on Jan. 22, 1899, under the title, *Testem benevolentiae*. Rampolla wrote to Gibbons that his protest had arrived too late and that the Pope had been forced to act to prevent a more serious division within the French Church.

The letter indicated that on the occasion of the publication of the French biography of Hecker certain doctrines had arisen which the Holy Father thought should be condemned. The main error was that in the new age the Church should relax her former severity and make approach to the Church easier, now that the Vatican Council had made the Church secure by the decree of papal infal-

libility. Based on this false premise certain other false doctrines were being proposed, such as, that external guidance of the Church should be set aside for direct intervention of the Holy Ghost in this new age; that greater importance should be given to natural virtues as better fitted for the problems of the age; that, dividing virtues into active and passive, active virtues were needed in the new age; that the vows of religious were alien to the modern world; and, finally, that the Church must devise a new method for winning back those outside the fold. The Holy Father did insist that he in no way wished to condemn the political theories, laws or customs of the United States.

Abbé Klein immediately submitted to Cardinal Richard. In his new account Klein expresses the thought that his hasty submission made it appear that he felt guilty of the heresies. Actually, he felt that the charges were phantom heresies raised up by the conservative French clergy to offset the effect of American Catholic progress and the trend toward co-operation with the French Republic. Archbishop Ireland, although he later admitted that he did not enjoy the trend of events, publicly thanked the Holy Father for the letter, saying that at no time had he ever held the doctrines condemned in the Apostolic letter. Keane wrote in a similar manner. Gibbons wrote that no Catholic instructed in his religion held the doctrines condemned, but did not give his letter to the press. Abbé Klein published in his autobiography a letter received from Bishop Thomas O'Gorman of Sioux Falls in March, 1900, in which O'Gorman says that there were at that time fourteen other archbishops in the United States besides Ireland. Three, Feehan of Chicago, Hennessy of Dubuque, and Bourgade of Santa Fe, did not reply to the Pope's letter. Four thanked the Pope for his solicitude but did not indicate that the doctrine existed in the country. They were Elder of Cincinnati, Chapelle of New Orleans, Christie of Portland and Ryan of Philadelphia. Ryan of Philadelphia said it could scarcely be found in the country. Four expressly denied that it existed in the country: Riordan of San Francisco, Kain of Saint Louis, Williams of Boston and Gibbons of Baltimore. Only two indicated that the doctrines existed in the country: Corrigan of New York and Katzer of Milwaukee. The New York letter indicated that the heresies existed in germ but that the letter would destroy them. Although sent in the names of all the bishops of the

New York province, some of the suffragans denied that they had signed it. The Archbishop of Milwaukee claimed that the denial of the American bishops that the heresy existed among them was a Jansenistic denial. The *Civilta Cattolica* published only some of these letters and subscribed to the theory of the Milwaukee archbishop.

In this country at the next meeting of the archbishops a motion was made by Archbishop Ireland to investigate the charges of the Milwaukee prelate but in the vote that followed the presiding vote of Cardinal Gibbons prevented any action. Archbishop Katzer was absent. In France the attempt of the conservatives to claim that the Pope had condemned the democratic tendencies of the day was denied by Pope Leo XIII in a letter to Archbishop Servonnet of Bourges, dated May 25, 1899. Klein does not carry the controversy beyond the condemnation. Archbishop Ireland returned to favor with the Holy See but neither he nor Archbishop Corrigan ever attained their much desired cardinalates. Abbé Klein does not give much attention to the American phase of the controversy but he does show quite well that the European controversialists over Americanism were at war not over the Church in the United States but actually over the Church in western Europe.

THOMAS T. MCAVOY, C.S.C.

*The University of Notre Dame*
*Notre Dame, Ind.*

---

PROTECTORS OF THE ROMAN BASILICAS

As the Lateran Basilica has been taken under the special protection of the kings of France, and that of St. Paul's is said to have owned the English monarchs for its patrons, so the church of St. Mary Major was identified for centuries with his most Catholic Majesty of Spain. One visible sign of this connection may still be seen in the richly-panelled and ornamented roof. It is gilded, we are told, with the first gold brought from America and presented to Pope Alexander VI by Ferdinand and Isabella.

—Fr. Thurston, S.J., in *The Holy Year of Jubilee* (Westminster, Maryland: The Newman Press, 1949), p. 205.

# WE OWE IT TO OUR NUNS

## Part I

Few priests reach the altar without having piled up a sizable debt to the nuns. Still fewer go far in their priestly life without seeing that debt notably increased. From that teacher in first grade to the hospital sister at our sickbed, from the unseen contemplative to whose prayers we wisely entrust our needs, to the sister sacristan, the sister principal, and now the sister social worker—the nun is someone who does an excellent job with a maximum of devotedness and efficiency and a minimum of demands upon us.

All that is matter for axioms; our daily experience offers the compelling proofs.

The corollary to that is—as corollaries often are—a part of the text written in small print and needing a little thoughtful reading. The corollary runs: They have done much for us, these nuns; our obligations to them are obligations in justice as well as in gratitude. Indeed they are obligations in self-interest. For the nun's help to us is more effective in proportion as she is a better, more spiritual, more apostolically inspired religious.

Our Mass said for her in the early morning is the essential forward nudge that is given her day. The occasional instruction we may be commissioned to give in a convent chapel is often the only direct spiritual and doctrinal aid she gets. We can never forget that we priests have been instructed in dogmatic and moral theology; many nuns get only the highly diluted summaries of theology that we give them. Our association with the Eucharistic Christ and the soul of the Church is more intimate than theirs; they must wait for us to pass on to them the spirituality in our souls.

When they come to us in confession, we have the chance beyond all others to repay the debt that every priest must acknowledge to the sisters in general and in particular to the sisters who work in some sort of partnership with us in parish and in school.

Our seminary preparation for the hearing of confessions can be somewhat misleading. Despite the dry presentation, and the cases that in stilted and sometimes artificial Latin possess few of the elements of an exciting short story, the truth remains that the cure

of souls looks like an exciting affair. The breaking of the commandments turns out to be the basis of most interesting literature. Without evil you could hardly hope to have a great drama, a great novel, even a great narrative poem. A holy life seems an unexciting life until it comes to grips with evil—the evil of temptation, of personal weakness, of bad men and worse women, of the devil in the thousand fascinating forms he is permitted to assume.

So under the dry elements of moral theology and very close to the surface lies the problem of evil, than which there is no more engrossing subject.

Hence when we come to the confessional, we expect that our penitents may be—at least on fairly regular occasions—rather exciting people. After all we are sure that truth is stranger than fiction. In the confessional, we tell ourselves, we shall have truth uttered from broken hearts and in great floods of penitence, by people who have come to grips with the devil himself and who on entering the confessional will be penitent Hamlets, Fausts, Marguerites, Carmens, and Scarlett O'Haras.

The reality of the confessional is perhaps the strongest proof that God in the person of Christ the Savior, not a mere man, instituted the sacrament of penance. For, truth to tell, the hearing of confessions can be almost dreary business.

No man in his right mind would have dreamed up for the priest the penance of the confessional. If we give penances to our penitents, we know that the penance they give us is much, much heavier. Were it not for the certainty of the divine forgiveness that lies in the gesture of our hands and the words of absolution, we couldn't be dragged into the confessional. If we were not sure that through the emptying of their sins upon us they were going to win through our instrumentality as ministers of God the peace and forgiveness they crave, we could not tolerate the long recitals. Christ imposed the burden of the confessional upon us at the very time when He gave to us the power to absolve from sin. There is no power given a man but he must pay for it; the power of *Ego te absolvo* has as its price the tiresome hours of tedious listening to stories that cannot fail to bore the human side of us, even when it inspires the *Alter Christus* to divine mercy and pity.

However exciting the sin may have seemed to the sinner, by the time the story emerges, the sin has become the unglamorous thing

it is. There is nothing about it now that remains to enchant and enthrall even the sinner. So we priests sit and listen and see with a little of the clarity that Christ knew in Gethsemani the stark ugliness, the unromantic drabness, the endless monotony of evil.

But if sin is tiresome, at least the priest has the satisfaction of the "big catch." A night is almost brighter when the chap who stumbled in just before we closed the slide for the last time goes out absolved of twenty years of unconfessed sins. We hate the sin; we are delighted with the opportunity to handle a "big case." We can bear the tears of the sinful woman if we have the sense that we are helping her out of her slavery. We feel for the young person a deep sympathy that his callow sinning must inevitably awake. Young sinners are only a little more sad than old, old sinners. At least we can turn to them with the feeling that they need us and that the absolution will be almost in the nature of a major operation.

The confession of innocent children, that is a trial. And the confessions of good women struggling to find sufficient matter for absolution, and being rather startled at the suggestion that if they search their past life they may find something more serious—these are tedious and taxing to patience.

And the confessions of nuns . . .

Here I pause once more to remind myself and my fellow priests how much we owe the sisters. We are very much in their debt. We are cheating and showing the deepest ingratitude if we fail to realize that each confession of a nun is for her an opportunity as well as a trial, a place where she comes less to find forgiveness for sin than to receive encouragement for her undoubtedly difficult life.

The confession of a nun is the perfect illustration of what our professor of moral theology meant when he said that only part of the work of a priest in confession is the absolving of sins: "You are a physician. And a physician not only cures disease but must develop a prophylaxis against sin and must promote health. You do only part of your duty when you free from sins; you must help the penitent grow into the stature of a saint."

On one particularly bright autumn afternoon mine was an exceptional opportunity. In a strange city quite unfamiliar to me a group of sisters had asked me to talk to them. I had accepted with all the alacrity I feel at the privilege of talking to nuns, the world's

most alert, intelligent, and inspiring audience (I believe that most sincerely).

I had prepared a talk. But as I looked out over the hall filled with sisters, young, old, teaching, hospital, charity, institutional sisters, choir sisters and lay sisters, and even a few nuns from a local community that was moving toward the contemplative form of religion (at this time only as far as perpetual adoration of the Blessed Sacrament), my guardian angel or theirs nudged my mind.

If I gave the talk I had prepared, I should give them what I thought they ought to hear. Did I know what they wanted to hear? On sudden inspiration—and perhaps sticking my neck far out over my clerical collar—I said, "May I make a change? If my suggestion doesn't attract you, I still have a talk that I prepared, and I shall give it. My suggestion is this: Would our sister hostesses pass cards or pieces of paper to each of you? Will you anonymously write whatever questions you would like me to answer? or problems you would like me to discuss? or some subject or idea you want me to talk about that you feel would be of real help to you?"

I gambled, and I won.

Their questions were stimulating and at times startling. All the questions were intelligent, though occasionally they were a little pathetic and wistful.

For—and here is the point of this discussion—of the more than fifty questions submitted to me, almost ten were concerned with the confessions of nuns:

"How can I make fruitful my confession, which has become frightfully routine?"

"I dread confession—less because of big sins, which are mercifully rare, than because of the hideous repetitions of the same old small, petty, monotonous sins."

"How can I make my confession serve toward the perfection of my religious life?"

"Father, there are two elements to a confession, the person confessing and the priest listening. Our confessor is in a dreadful hurry. He rushes us so. I know he is busy. But if he had a little more time . . ."

"We were told in the novitiate that we should ask our confessor for the spiritual help we need. There is almost no one else to whom we can go. Yet when I get up the courage to ask my confessor, he

seems startled. At best he gives me a routine, stereotyped little homily that might fit anyone."

"Often I go into the confessional lonely and depressed. Nothing that happens there helps the situation. Could the confessor use the time for a little optimism, inspiration, encouragement?"

"The confessional, I have often heard told and have often read, is a place for spiritual guidance. Is that entirely theoretic? Save when the retreatmaster comes once a year (and not always even then), confession is a matter of my rattling off my sins and receiving a penance and absolution; no time or place for spiritual guidance. I am hungry for the things of God. Doesn't my confessor, our good but so rushed and hurried priest, know how we need his direction?"

As I read card after card, a ripple of nervous laughter swept the nuns. Evidently all of them were recognizing something that they understood. The cards spoke their collective minds. They were listening to confession described as what it was, a box into which were dropped small sins and defects and sins committed in the past. The confessional was not for them a place of guidance, a place where they learned something of the control of small and annoying faults. They were cleansed from petty sins; they were not helped to sanctity. They were being treated as routine venial sinners, hardly ever apparently as potential saints.

I happened to know the priests of that district well enough to be sure that they are very good and zealous men. More than that: I was certain they would have been startled had they learned that the nuns (many of whom they knew well from close association in their diocesan and parish projects) wanted this sort of help. They would never have suspected the sisters' spiritual hunger confessed so poignantly on those cards.

I thought about the whole matter long and deeply that late afternoon—and I have thought of it often since then. I have decided that some of the difficulties or mental hazards that keep me and my associates from hearing effectively the confessions of nuns might well be some of the following:

(1) I know that nuns are extremely good women, many of them close to sanctity. I know my own defects and limitations so bitterly that I hesitate to set myself up as a guide for perfection.

(2) After all the nuns know all about confession. If they want to ask a question, they'll ask it. If they don't ask, it's an indication that they prefer not to be bothered.

(3) The constant repetition of very small faults makes me dull and slightly drugged . . . no big and startling sin to jolt me into alertness. I could easily predict what I shall hear today, and repetion is a dulling experience.

(4) The diocesan—secular priest sometimes says: "I do not pretend to understand religious life, least of all the religious life of women. If they need guidance for their life of the vows and the religious rule, it should be given them by priest-religious; I am not prepared to give such guidance and perhaps not equipped for it."

(5) It's the infernal question of time. The nuns are rushed; they have to squeeze in time for confession between heavy duties; in some cases I actually know that they have left heavy responsibilities in order to come to confession; so I hesitate to keep them any longer than is required for the bare essentials. Besides, I'm pretty busy myself.

(6) I am so closely associated with them during our workaday week in the parish or school that spiritual talk and guidance to perfection might seem to come badly from me. They know me too well.

(7) I've been hearing their confessions for three years now; at first I attempted a little talk before the absolution; frankly I've run out of ideas.

(8) Get a saint to confess saints.

The answers become obvious even as we enumerate the objections.

When the priest enters the confessional, he is no longer the sinful man; he is the divinely appointed guide. If he cannot say, "Do as I do," he can say, "Do as I say." God will make docile the heart of the nun who happens to know our defects and limitations. For our great reassurance we must remember that St. Theresa preferred as her confessor a good theologian who was not a saint rather than a very holy man who didn't know theology. (By the way . . . if we really hear confessions well, we have a new stimulus to refresh our theology.)

Nuns undoubtedly know a great deal about confession. But they are also shy, surprisingly shy. Their conviction that you and

I are very busy men is deep in their conscious and subconscious. They know that they may ask if they wish; but they hesitate. Our manner is hurried; we dash along toward the absolution. They are diffident about intruding upon our "express" schedule. In addition many of their most pressing questions sound a little silly and trifling; though they know that to a confessor nothing that worries the penitent is either silly or trifling, they come right up to the question hesitantly—and then pull back. Especially do they act this way when we are clearly not too eager to be bothered.

Perhaps the very way to prevent oneself from becoming dull and apathetic is to refuse to allow confessions to seem routine. We can make each afternoon of confessions an event. We can turn from one penitent to the next with the inner conviction that each penitent is individual, distinctive, each having her own problems, temptations, and aspirations. If you have ever been spiritual director for a girl who has entered the religious life, you have hoped that when she comes to confession she finds the guidance and help she needs. Should you have a sister a nun, you would prefer that she be spared the dime-in-the-turnstile type of confession. It is very likely that someone may be thinking and wishing the same for the nuns who confess to you.

"I am a diocesan priest and not a religious, a regular." Yet the Church entrusts the overwhelming majority of religious' confessions to diocesan priests. It is a duty imposed upon them, a responsibility they cannot shirk. To do that duty badly is to fail in something very important. A brain specialist will set a leg if he happens to be the only doctor in the vicinity. In an emergency a medical internist will do the work of a surgeon, though he may have had no recent familiarity with the knife. At any rate I wonder whether unfamiliarity with religious life is a valid or quite honest excuse. The seminary training of all priests is meant to fit them for the handling of all types of souls. You come to the nuns from Mass and the office, from meditation and spiritual reading, from a life dedicated to high sanctity and a close devotion to Christ. Whatever the theory that may divide secular priests from regular, today the practice of both is very similar. Aside from a novitiate, the training is much the same; the work is more and more identified. A great many of the finest confessors I have ever known were men who did not take the three vows; they were men who

loved God, aspired to high sanctity, and knew the rules of the spiritual life.

Time! time! time! Time the enemy! Time the intruder! Nuns are burdened women, slaves of the clocks and the bells, no doubt of that. But the escape they make to the chapel may be a welcome one. Perhaps they are in no deadly rush to get back to noisy pupils or complaining patients. A little more time given to them for their own souls will send them back to their duties more ready, more eager, less weary, wonderfully refreshed.

You and I are busy? Not so busy that we ever need be sloppy in fulfilling one of the important responsibilities assigned us.

The attitude of nuns toward priests is a wonderful one, indeed an amazing one. Despite the fact of their constant association with us in work, their knowledge of our limitations and defects, the stirring of our bad tempers, their contact with our worldliness, they retain a respect and deference for our priestly character that is rooted in divine faith.

I have always felt intense pity for the nuns who must go to confession week after week to some cross-grained clerical grouch who wages a kind of petty persecution against them and whose impatience and selfishness are the talk of the parish. Yet when they go into his confessional, he is their priest, and they are his penitent children. They have a great, almost miraculous ability to abstract. They think of the power of absolution, not of his irritability. They hear a powerful voice saying, *Ego te absolvo,* not the voice that snapped or whined or complained or spoke unkindly. How wonderful is their patience with us! How marvelous that we can sit in the confessional, our own faults forgotten, our priestly character—stark and wonderful and filled with power—the one thing that remains.

The years during which we have heard the confessions of a group of nuns are testimony to at least one motive for our not growing slack. I confess that this takes planning and some forethought. Yet there are distinct advantages that come from the effort we put forth. At the end of a few months we come to know their needs. We recognize their voices. We can encourage the nun touched with sickness; we can help week after week the cure of this or that distressing fault. We can plan for their spiritual progress; we can become the father of their souls.

So far I have talked perhaps too much theory.

May I in a following discussion speak of the practical aspect? Future generations of nuns will be more and more grateful if the generations of priests enter the confessional with the knowledge that here is a place where real help and inspiration can be given. A good and happy nun is an incalculable power with souls. Nothing else, save contact with the Blessed Sacrament, can do more to make them holier and happier than can contact with a priest who is sincerely interested in giving them the very best that confession can afford.

Let's take that up in our next discussion.

DANIEL A. LORD, S.J.

*St. Louis, Missouri*

---

THE ROSARY AND "REUNION"

Meditation on the mysteries of the Rosary, often repeated in a spirit of faith, cannot help but please her and move her, the fondest of mothers, to show mercy to her children.

For that reason we say that the Rosary is by far the best prayer by which to plead before her the cause of our separated brethren. To grant a favorable hearing belongs properly to her office of spiritual Mother. For Mary has not brought forth—nor could she—those who are of Christ except in the one same faith and in the one same love; for "Is Christ divided?" And all must live the life of Christ in an organic unity in order to bring forth fruit to God in the one same body. Every one of the multitudes, therefore, whom the mischief of calamitous events has stolen away from that unity, must be born again to Christ of that same Mother whom God has endowed with a never-failing fertility to bring forth a holy people.

Pope Leo XIII, in his encyclical *Adiutricem populi,* issued Sept. 5, 1895.

# THE BAPTISMAL CHARACTER AND MEMBERSHIP IN THE CATHOLIC CHURCH

At first glance, it would seem that few theses in all the literature of scholastic theology could have as restricted an appeal as the one dealing with the nature of the sacramental character. To translate literally the thesis on this matter in one of the most widely received text-books of sacred theology, that of the late Archbishop Valentine Zubizarreta, "the sacramental character is a spiritual potency, not complete and principal, but rather incomplete and ministerial or instrumental, and it is reduced to the second species of quality."[1] It would seem hard to find a statement which could serve more effectively to bolster the contentions of that always highly articulate group who maintain that scholastic theology is a sort of rarified intellectual pastime for the erudite and that it is something which must be by-passed if we are to bring a vital understanding of Our Lord's message to the people for whom He died on the Cross.

The statement we have cited from Zubizarreta seems also to fall afoul of the warning issued by Fr. Henri Bouillard, in his work, *Conversion et grace chez S. Thomas d'Aquin.* Speaking of the Council of Trent's declaration that "huius iustificationis . . . unica formalis causa est iustitia Dei, non qua ipse iustus est, sed qua nos iustos facit . . ." Fr. Bouillard teaches that the Council did not thereby render definitive and immutable the description of sanctifying grace as a formal cause. He holds that "it was certainly not the intention of the Council to canonize an Aristotelian notion, nor even a theological concept conceived under Aristotle's influence."[2] He believes that the Council, in order effectively to contradict the heretical teachings current in its own day, employed notions which were common in the then contemporary world of theology. He asserts that other notions can be substituted for these concepts without modifying the sense of the Council's teaching.

Obviously, if such be the case with regard to an explicit statement of an oecumenical council, there would be even less reason

[1] *Theologia dogmatico-scholastica,* 3rd edition (Bilbao, 1939), IV, 73.

[2] *Conversion et grace chez S. Thomas d'Aquin* (Paris: Aubier, 1944), pp. 221 f.

to predicate any definitive or permanent status to concepts employed in the literature of sacred theology. Thus, since the definition and the division of quality, in the sense in which this concept is utilized in the common teaching of theology about the nature of the sacramental character, is definitely of Aristotelian provenance, it would certainly seem that these concepts might well be abandoned, if we are to follow the trend so ably manifested by Fr. Bouillard. Indeed, it might appear that the concepts of quality and of the second species of quality may be numbered among those to which Fr. Bouillard refers when he states that "In order that theology may continue to offer the mind a meaning, in order that it may impregnate [the mind] and progress along with it, it is necessary that it should renounce these notions." [3]

Some of the best known scholastic theologians have regarded the thesis about the nature of the sacramental character as unimportant. Thus, for example, Christian Pesch declares that "this affair does not seem to be of great use," [4] and Parthenius Minges says that it is "a question of lesser importance." [5]

Despite its somewhat forbidding terminology, however, and despite a noticeable modern antipathy to Aristotelian concepts, the common teaching on the nature of the sacramental character must be recognized as one of the most valuable keys to a proper theological understanding of membership in the true Church, and of the nature both of the universal kingdom of God on earth and of the local Church itself. The fact that a highly technical wording of this thesis has served to some extent to distract attention from the tremendous meaning conveyed in this thesis must, in the final analysis, be reckoned as a distinct misfortune for the cause of scholastic theology.

In the present status of sacred theology, the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas on the nature of the sacramental character must undoubtedly be considered as at least the more common doctrine on this particular subject. St. Thomas held that "sacraments of the new law imprint a character in so far as through them men are commissioned *(deputantur)* to the worship of God according to the

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 224.

[4] Cf. *Praelectiones dogmaticae*, 4th edition (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1914), VI, 86.

[5] Cf. *Compendium theologiae dogmaticae specialis*, 2nd edition (Regensburg: Pustet, 1922), II, 96.

rite of the Christian religion." [6] It is for this reason that the character is designated as a quality of the second species, a *potentia,* as distinguished from a *habitus,* from the *passiones,* and from outward forms and figures.[7]

He insisted that the sacramental character is not something that falls directly within the compass of the definition which Aristotle gave for a *potentia.* In his *Categories* Aristotle had described this second species of quality as "that in virtue of which, for example, we call men good boxers or runners, or healthy or sickly: in fact it includes all those terms which refer to inborn capacity or incapacity." [8] St. Thomas knew that the sacramental character could not fit perfectly into this classification. He knew that it was distinctly a supernatural entity, an instrumental factor by which a person was rendered capable of entering upon a type of operation distinct from and superior to the sort of activity to which man is naturally proportioned. He claimed, however, that this character could best and most effectively be described in terms of this second species of quality, or that it was *reduced* to a *potentia.*[9]

St. Thomas taught, furthermore, that, since the sacramental character is the factor by which men are commissioned to receive or to deliver to their fellows the realities which belong to the rite of the Christian religion, and since the works of the Christian religion themselves pertain to the priesthood of Christ, that these sacramental characters are nothing less than sharings or partakings in Our Lord's priesthood, derived from Our Lord Himself.[10] He wrote that in this way the sacramental character must be considered as a factor "configuring" men to Christ, and that thus, properly speaking, it was the character of Christ.

According to the Angelic Doctor the faithful are configured to Christ in the sense that "they partake of a certain spiritual power with respect to the sacraments and to those things that pertain to divine worship." [11] The notion of worship or of the fulfillment of

[6] *Summa theologica,* III, q. 63, a. 2.

[7] *Ibid.*

[8] *Categoriae,* c. 8. The translation is that of E. M. Edghill in *The Works of Aristotle* (Oxford: The Clarendon Press, 1928).

[9] Cf. *Summa theologia, loc. cit.*

[10] Cf. III, q. 63, a. 3.

[11] III, q. 63, a. 5.

the obligations of religion is always inextricably bound up with the concept of the sacramental character throughout the writings of St. Thomas. Ultimately, however, he saw this worship or *cultus* as the outward manifestation of divine faith. It was for this reason that he maintained stoutly that the sacramental character, like faith itself, was in the intellect as in an immediate subject.[12]

It is a commonplace of Catholic theology that the entire sacramental system revolves around the Eucharist. To mention only the three sacraments which imprint a character on the soul,

> It is manifest that the Sacrament of Order is ordained towards the consecration of the Eucharist. The Sacrament of Baptism is ordered towards the reception of the Eucharist. A man is perfected along this same line by Confirmation, so that he may not turn aside from such a Sacrament through fear.[13]

Plainly, then, the sacramental character, which commissions a man for the worship of God according to the rite of the Christian religion, is definitely and primarily concerned with the Eucharist. And, since this same baptismal character is the basic factor which constitutes a man as a member of the true Church militant, it follows inevitably that the essential status of the Christian or the *fidelis* is that of a man commissioned to take his part in the worship of God that surrounds and is summed up in the Eucharistic sacrifice. The Church militant itself is thus seen as a society which can be described accurately in terms of its basic and central activity, the Eucharistic cult.

According to St. Thomas Aquinas, the baptismal character differs from that imparted through the Sacrament of Holy Orders as a passive potency differs from an active one.[14] The priestly character enables a man to confect the Eucharist: the baptismal character makes a person capable of receiving it. And, since the same Holy Eucharist is at once a sacrament and a sacrifice, the baptismal character places the man who possesses it in the status of one to whom the Eucharistic sacrifice belongs, and for whom it is offered.

Sacrifice, of course, is essentially and necessarily a social act of worship. It belongs to a company or a community, rather than to an individual. The one society within which the sacramental char-

[12] Cf. III, q. 63, a. 4, ad 3.

[13] III, q. 65, a. 3.

[14] Cf. III, q. 63, a. 2.

acter of baptism empowers a man to receive the Eucharist fruitfully and legitimately is the very community whose sacrifice the Eucharist really is. By the very fact that the sacrament of baptism is the rite of initiation into this society, it follows necessarily that the main business of the Christian community and of the individual member of the Church is expressed in the Eucharistic sacrifice. The Christian or member of the true Church is one who is joined to Our Lord by the power of this commemorative sacrifice, and who worships God with Christ in this same true act of sacrifice.

In this light it is easy to see how and why the power of jurisdiction in the local Church, and, for that matter in the Church universal, is something which is meant to be conjoined with the full prefection of the power of orders. Because the local Church is essentially a community whose central business is the Eucharistic sacrifice, it follows that the leader of that Church should be a man who possesses the sacramental character of Holy Orders in all of its completeness. To use the terminology of Cardinal Billot, the theologian who has treated this section of ecclesiology most effectively among modern writers, the man who has the power of jurisdiction within the Church should possess this sacramental character of orders so that he may possess and exercise his power of jurisdiction "regulari ac connaturali modo." [15]

Essentially the local Church is the company or brotherhood of the faithful, of men and women empowered to join with Our Lord in the offering of the Eucharistic sacrifice. Endowed with apostolic power and working in his capacity as a true successor of the apostles, the bishop presides over the community, surrounded and attended by the fraternity of his diocesan priests and assisted by the deacons and the other ministers. Since the central and primary work of this community is the Eucharistic sacrifice, the principal act of the Christian religion, the man in command could not fulfil his own commission adequately without having the capacity, not only to offer the sacrifice as Christ's instrument for his people, but also to fill up the ranks of his own *presbyterium* and to consecrate the episcopal leaders of other local Churches according to the dictates of that *amor fraternitatis* which is a binding force within God's kingdom.

[15] Cf. *Tractatus de ecclesia Christi*, 5th edition (Rome: Gregorian University, 1927), I, 344.

The same thing is true, for a far greater reason, with respect to the command of the Church universal. No man could connaturally exercise the supreme power of jurisdiction over the entire Church of Jesus Christ on earth without being equipped, through the fullness of the sacerdotal character, to offer the Eucharistic sacrifice for St. Peter's Roman Church, to replenish the *presbyterium* of that Church, and to fill the ranks of the priesthood and the episcopate in and for the other Churches subject to his care.

The Holy Father and the other residential bishops of the Catholic Church require the possession of the episcopal character for the fitting performance of their duties precisely because the Church militant of the New Testament has been so wrought and fashioned by Our Lord that the baptismal character is the basic and primary requisite for membership in it. Unless men were constituted as members of this community by reason of a divinely given capacity for taking part in the Eucharistic sacrifice, the Mass could not be, as it actually is, the supreme and the central activity of the Church.

Precisely because it is an instrumental *potentia*, a sharing or partaking in Our Lord's own eternal priesthood, the sacramental character of baptism can never be destroyed or effaced. It is in the human soul, or, to speak more exactly, in the human intellect, as St. Thomas tells us, "according to the condition of the principal agent" [16] of that activity a man is empowered and directed to perform by reason of this sacramental character. The principal agent of this Eucharistic worship is, of course, Christ, the Eternal High Priest. The quality by which a man is enabled and commissioned to share in that activity must itself be everlasting.

This indestructible sacramental character of baptism is the factor which actively constitutes a man as a member of the Church, however, only when its force or tendency is not frustrated by some act of the individual who possesses this *potentia* or of the Church itself. It is the common teaching of scholastic ecclesiology that a baptized person loses his membership in the Church only by way of public apostasy or heresy, schism, or the full measure of excommunication. In each one of these instances the capacity for the worship of God according to the rite of the Christian religion is manifestly frustrated or impeded. The standard Thomistic teaching about the nature of the sacramental character offers us a valu-

[16] Cf. III, q. 63, a. 5.

able and even unique insight into the reasons why these factors definitely and necessarily bring about loss of membership in the true Church of Jesus Christ. Thus it likewise gives us an understanding of the nature and the immediate implications of membership in the Church.

Christian worship constitutes, according to St. Thomas, a definite and outward profession of divine faith.[17] This characteristic of the Eucharistic sacrifice and of the other acts that center around it is so pronounced that the *potentia* by which a man is empowered to enter into this religious activity is said to exist in the intellect, the seat of divine faith itself, as its immediate subject. Hence any public denial or repudiation of that faith, any entrance into a society whose tenets or practices are incompatible with that faith, must be considered as frustrating the capacity or *potentia* in terms of which a man is said to be a member of the Church. Thus such conduct necessarily involves a forfeiture of membership.

Similarly the Eucharist is at once the sign and the cause of the Church's unity. Since the fundamental factor for membership in the Church is a capacity for the Eucharistic worship and life, it is obvious that schism, the breaking off of that unity, constitutes an act of opposition to the force of the baptismal character itself and so must be considered as bringing about a loss of membership in Our Lord's kingdom on earth. And when the Church, by reason of grievous offenses committed by one who has been numbered among its members, shuts that person out completely from the sacramental life which his baptismal character had empowered him to live, that man must be said to have lost his membership in the company of the disciples.

Such, briefly, are some of the more manifest implications in the field of ecclesiology of the Thomistic teaching about the sacramental character. Only when we realize that this *res et sacramentum* of baptism is something which can be explained in terms of the thing Aristotle described as the second species of quality can we appreciate the central place of the Eucharistic life in the Church and the fundamental liturgical orientation of membership in the Church itself. Only in terms of St. Thomas Aquinas' teaching on this subject can we come to understand the interrelations of the powers of orders and of jurisdiction within God's kingdom on earth.

[17]Cf. III, q. 63, a. 4, ad 3.

The history of sacred theology shows that there has been a considerable amount of confusion about the concept of membership in the Church and, that in point of fact, that confusion was intimately connected with a rejection or a misunderstanding of St. Thomas' teaching about the nature of the sacramental character. Francis Suarez, one of the truly great theologians in the history of the Catholic Church, has had a somewhat harmful effect on ecclesiology as a result of his insistence that true and sincere internal faith, rather than the sacramental character of baptism, was the basic and essential factor constituting membership in the Church.[18] It is interesting to observe that Suarez' position in the field of ecclesiology is intimately connected with his judgment on the nature of the sacramental character. His teaching on this latter subject is summed up in the following statement.

> I consider the character to be a quality of the first species, that is, a disposition or *habitus*, joined to the soul itself, and perfecting it formally, without any respect to works, in the same way that beauty or health constitutes the good disposition of a body.[19]

Gabriel Vasquez and John Wiggers, among others, followed Suarez in this teaching, although the latter was careful to insist that St. Thomas doctrine on this same subject was "not improbable." The net effect of their pronouncements about the nature of the sacramental character, however, was to obscure their concepts of the Church and of membership in the Church.[20]

Ultimately a denial or a misunderstanding of the fact that the baptismal character is a *potentia* or a capacity by which a man is empowered and commissioned to participate in the worship of God according to the Eucharistic activity of the Christian religion involves a confusion about Our Lord's presence and activity within His society. The Eucharistic worship of God is the very activity to which a man is ordered and directed by the sacramental character. The character is essentially a capacity or *potentia* for this

[18] Cf. *Opus de triplici virtute theologica* (Lyons, 1621), De fide, disp. 9, sect. 1, pp. 160 ff.

[19] In III, q. 63, a. 4, disp. 11, sect. 3, in the *Opera Omnia* (Paris: Vives, 1866), XX, 195.

[20] Cf. Vasquez, *Commentaria ac disputationes in tertiam partem Sancti Thomae* (Lyons, 1631), II, 229; Wiggers, *Commentaria in tertiam partem Divi Thomae* (Louvain, 1689), p. 48.

activity, and it is likewise the very factor which, when unimpeded, constitutes a man as a member of the Church.

Jesus Christ, the eternal High Priest, is the principal cause or agent of this activity. In this capacity He is truly and properly said to dwell and act within the Church. The reality that constitutes a man as a member of the Church is one which enables him to act as a participant or sharer in this Eucharistic activity as a part of that company within which Our Lord offers His sacrifice.

Fortunately for the status of theology in our own country, most of the theological manuals in common use here propound the teaching of St. Thomas on the nature of the sacramental character. Billot, Tanquerey, Hervé, Ferland, Hugon, and Egger all classify the sacramental character under the heading of *potentia*.[21] The brilliant American theologians, Otten, Connell, and Doronzo, all offer eminently satisfactory explanations of St. Thomas' doctrine on this point.[22] The recent and excellent manuals of Daffara and Piolanti offer the same teaching.[23]

To overlook this teaching on the ground that it is couched in technical language or to dismiss it as merely of academic interest is to neglect what can be one of the most valuable aids available to the Catholic in his labors for an increasingly profound appreciation of Christ's Mystical Body.

JOSEPH CLIFFORD FENTON

*The Catholic University of America*
*Washington, D. C.*

[21] Cf. Billot, *De ecclesiae sacramentis*, 7th edition (Rome: Gregorian University, 1931), I, 156 ff.; Tanquerey, *Synopsis theologiae dogmaticae*, 19th edition (Tournai: Desclée, 1922), III, 231; Hervé, *Manuale theologiae dogmaticae* (Paris: Berche et Pagis, 1929), III, 444 ff.; Ferland, *Commentarius in summam D. Thomae: De sacramentis in speciali et de novissimis* (Montreal: Grand Seminary, 1940), pp. 43, 114, 460; Hugon, *Tractatus dogmatici*, 5th edition (Paris: Lethielleux, 1927), 115 f.; Egger, *Enchiridion theologiae dogmaticae specialis*, 9th edition (Brescia: Weger, 1928), pp. 751 f.

[22] Cf. Otten, *Institutiones dogmaticae* (Chicago: Loyola University, 1923), V, 171 ff.; Connell, *De sacramentis ecclesiae* (Bruges: Beyart ,1933), I, 94; Doronzo, *De sacramentis in genere* (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1946), 296 ff.

[23] Cf. Daffara, *Cursus manualis theologiae dogmaticae* (Turin: Marietti, 1944), 73 ff.; Piolanti, *De sacramentis* (Turin: Marietti, 1945), I, 103 ff.

# Answers to Questions

## OSCILLATION IN THE DISTRIBUTION OF HOLY COMMUNION

*Question:* (1) Is there any strict rule which prescribes the distribution of Holy Communion by moving always from left to right? (2) May a priest, advanced in age, save himself by reversing the order of giving Holy Communion, that is, after completing the first rail from left to right, continue by moving from the Gospel to the Epistle side? (3) If the practice described under (2) be lawful, may the assistants at the church, for the sake of uniformity, follow the same procedure?

*Answer:* (1) The rubrics of the Missal (*Ritus serv.* X, 6) prescribe that the priest distribute Holy Communion by moving from the Epistle side to the Gospel side, from left to right. This, then, is the correct procedure. (2) When the celebrant is incapacitated, by reason of age or infirmity, or for any other good reason, we are of the opinion that he might "save himself" by continuing the distribution of Holy Communion, after ministering to the first row of communicants, moving to his left, instead of going across the sanctuary to start again from the Epistle side. (3) We do not think that the assistants should follow the practice of the disabled pastor by using this oscillating method of distributing Holy Communion any more than they should reduce their genuflections at Mass to the minor dimensions made necesary for the pastor because of his arthritic knees.

## THE USE OF SYNTHETIC ASHES

*Question:* Is it required that the ashes blessed and distributed on Ash Wednesday be made from burning the palms of the preceding year or is this only a custom? When the residue from the burned palms is not sufficient, would it be proper to mix with it other ashes in order to provide enough for distribution in a large parish?

*Answer:* Not merely custom, but a definite provision of the

rubrics, found at the beginning of the text of the Missal for Ash Wednesday, requires that the ashes to be blessed and distributed on the first day of Lent be those resulting from burning the palms of the preceding year. However, if so few palm branches are still extant when preparation for Ash Wednesday is due, we think that other ashes may be mixed with the residue of the burned palms to provide a sufficient quantity for distribution. This opinion is based on parity with the legislation concerning baptismal water and the holy oils, both of which may be supplemented by unblessed material, always in less quantity than the original, when the supply of water or oils becomes low. Care should be taken, naturally, to preserve a sufficient number of palm branches for the manufacture of ashes for Lent. We wonder that some ultra-modern "church-goods" house does not advertise some synthetic substitute for the ashes of the palms, made perhaps of plastic or soy beans, and recommended as better than the liturgical product.

## REPETITION OF THE APOSTOLIC BLESSING FOR THE SICK

*Question:* When a priest is anointing a person for the second or third time, and the Apostolic blessing was given the first time, should the blessing be repeated?

*Answer:* The Sacred Congregation of Indulgences, on June 20, 1836, decreed that *per se* the Apostolic Blessing is not to be repeated even if the Sacrament of Extreme Unction should be given again. A decree, shortly subsequent, that of Feb. 12, 1842, provided that the blessing might be repeated if the sick person recovered and then for any reason fell into a new danger of death. Whence, we conclude that it would not be necessary to repeat the blessing even if there were reason to administer Extreme Unction a second time but that it *may* be given each time that Extreme Unction is administered since that Sacrament is not to be repeated unless the patient has recovered and again experienced a new risk of life.

## WHAT NECESSITY JUSTIFIES THE SHORT FORM OF EXTREME UNCTION?

*Question:* Is one justified in using the short form of Extreme

Unction for a patient, alive and conscious, but violently sensitive to touch?

*Answer:* With the diffidence of one venturing beyond the frontier of his proper territory, we presume to give as our opinion that *necessitas* in the mind of the Ritual, when it allows the short form for Extreme Unction, is not confined to imminent danger of death but may be extended to cover other cases, such as that described by our enquirer.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

---

## COALESCENCE OF REPEATED THEFTS

*Question:* What amount would be required to constitute a grave sin of injustice through the coalescence of small thefts that are frequently committed—for example, every two weeks? When the thief realizes that he has stolen enough to constitute grave matter and then steals another small sum, does he commit a venial sin or another mortal sin?

*Answer:* It is difficult to give more than approximate figures when we attempt to determine the line of demarcation between grave and light matter in theft. However, the following are the more commonly accepted rules laid down by theologians.

If small thefts, sufficiently frequent to coalesce morally, are committed against the same person or the same company, the amount required to constitute grave matter would be one and a half times the amount that would be grave matter if the theft were committed by one act against this particular person or company. In this case, therefore, the gravity is determined by the financial status of the person or group (e.g. the owners of a store) that is the victim of the theft. Thus, if the individual from whom the money is stolen were in the upper brackets of the middle class—for example, a man whose daily income is about $20—the sum of $30, taken at fairly frequent intervals, as described by the questioner, would constitute grave matter.

If the money were taken from different persons at different times, the amount required to make grave matter would be double that which constitutes grave matter in a single act. If only a few persons —for example, three or four—are the victims, the sum would be

determined by their particular status. Thus, if three persons of the middle class such as was described above were the sufferers, about $40 would make a grave amount. But if the thief stole from many persons, taking only a small amount from each, over a period of time (for example, in the course of two months), the absolute amount (at present about $40) would be used as the norm. In that event the theft of $80 would constitute a mortal sin (cf. Davis, *Moral and Pastoral Theology* [London, Sheed and Ward, 1946], II, 308).

If a thief, after committing a mortal sin through petty thefts in any of the ways described, steals another small amount, it would seem to be *in se* a venial sin (cf. Damen *Theologia Moralis* [Turin, Marietti, 1947], I, n. 720). However the words of Noldin-Schmitt should be noted: "Small thefts which take place after grave matter is completed are mortal sins if the will to retain what has already been taken persists, and they are committed with advertence to the grave harm inflicted, because they coalesce and continue the former grave sin, but they constitute numerically one sin with it." (*Summa theologiae moralis* [Innsbruck, 1938], II, n. 422).

## THE OBLIGATION OF THE *MISSA PRO POPULO*

*Question:* Is the pastor of a national parish bound to celebrate the *Missa pro populo?*

*Answer:* If a national parish has definitely assigned boundaries, even though they may extend over large number of territorial parishes, the pastor is certainly bound to celebrate the *Missa pro populo.* In the case of a national parish having no definite boundaries, some have expressed doubt whether all the obligations of a pastor are binding on the priest in charge. But there seems to be no solid reason for doubting that he is the pastor in the full sense of the word, with all the rights and duties of a pastor toward the faithful committed to his care. Fr. Ciesluk, in his doctoral dissertation *National Parishes in the United States* (Washington: The Catholic University of America Press, 1944), p. 119, states: "One must conclude that pastors of national parishes, whether strictly personal or territorial, have the obligation of applying the official Mass for the people." A response given in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* more than twenty years ago supports the

same view: "National parishes are denominated 'paroeciae' in Canon 216,2; a 'parochus' is a person to whom a 'paroecia' has been entrusted. Therefore the pastor of a national parish has all the obligations of a 'parochus' including the obligation 'ex justitia' of celebrating Mass for the people even on suppressed feasts." (*AER*, LXXV, 5 [Nov. 1927], 525).

## GUM-CHEWING DURING MASS

*Question:* Would it be a sin for a person to chew gum while assisting at Mass?

*Answer:* This distinctively American custom might be permissible during Mass in the case of one who chews gum for a good reason of health—to overcome indigestion or to stifle a hacking cough. But, apart from some such reason of necessity it would undoubtedly be a venial sin of irreverence. Indeed, if it were done in an obstreperous manner or in a way indicative of indifference to the sacred rite that is going on, it could become a mortal sin, not only of irreverence but also of scandal.

## A STERILIZING OPERATION

*Question:* A new method of detecting the presence of cancer, called the Papanicolaou test, is said to be very successful, particularly when there is question of cancer of the womb. Sometimes this test manifests a cancerous condition even when the results of the other tests are negative. At times, however, the Papanicolaou test indicates only probability of the presence of cancer. In such a case would it be permissible to perform a hysterectomy?

*Answer:* In the case of a woman who is not pregnant, if a competent and conscientious surgeon believes that there is a solid probability (not a mere possibility, or a very slight indication) of the presence of cancer, it would seem that the excision of the womb would be justifiable. For there is good reason to believe that a pathological condition is present that will cause death if it is not checked in time; and in such circumstances it is not necessary to establish certainty of the existence of the dangerous condition, but a solid probability will suffice to justify even a sterilizing operation, such as is hysterectomy.

However, if the woman is pregnant, it would seem that mere probability of the presence of cancer would not justify the removal of the womb until the child is viable. For the certain death of the fetus would not be sufficiently compensated for by a mere probability that the mother is in need of an operation to save her life. Needless to say, absolute certainty is not required, nor would such certainty be available very often from a diagnosis. Moral certainty, flowing from arguments which indicate that it is much more probable that the cancerous condition exists, would suffice.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

---

## NATURAL AD SUPERNATURAL MYSTERIES

Conceive, if you can, how anything can be created out of nothing, how God is present everywhere, without being confined by space; conceive what eternity is; conceive, if you can, how in a living man, soul and body are joined together. Is it a wonder, then, if in revealed religion, in God's sanctuary, many mysteries are found, exceeding the reach of human comprehension, and which it would even be impious to attempt to fathom. The mysteries of revelation bear no proportion to the measure of human understanding. Reason leads you to the door of the sanctuary, but there it leaves you. Reason is now silent and God speaks; man listens, and adores. He sees evidently that he should believe; he hears God distinctly dictate mysteries, which he commands him to believe and to revere; but he understands not those mysteries, which he is commanded to revere. He is even more satisfied than if he understood what forms the object of his belief: because, what man's limited understanding can comprehend, appears to be less awful, less worthy of the divine greatness, than what human understanding cannot penetrate.

—Father Demetrius Galitzin, in *A Defence of Catholic Principles* (Baltimore: Lucas Brothers, 1837), pp. 61 f.

# Analecta

In the last number of the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis* for the year 1949 there is published the response of the Supreme Sacred Congregation of the Holy Office referring to the validity of baptism as conferred in the sects of the Disciples of Christ, the Presbyterians, the Congregationalists, the Baptists and the Methodists. The response was issued Dec. 28, 1949,[1] and avers that the baptism is to be presumed valid, so far as the intention of the minister is concerned, unless the contrary is proved in a particular case.

In the last number but one of the same official publication there appears the communication of the Sacred Congregation of Rites, dated July 13, 1949,[2] in which the Sacred Congregation confirms the previous requirement that only a pipe organ be used to accompany liturgical ceremonies. Nevertheless it permits Ordinaries to consult their Diocesan Music Commissions in individual cases in which it is found difficult to obtain a pipe organ and to allow the use of the electric organ with such qualifications as the Diocesan Music Commissions may suggest.

In the same number there is contained a letter of the Sacred Congregation of Seminaries and Universities, dated Aug. 15, 1949,[3] setting forth norms for the teaching of sacred music in seminaries. The letter orders that sacred music be included among the required subjects to be taught from first year Latin to the end of the fourth year of theology; that the yearly schedule, to be inserted in the general catalog, be approved by the bishop; that annual examinations be given in this subject; and that the instructor in this subject have all the rights and privileges of other members of the faculty. In connection with the last point, it reminds bishops of the desire of Pius XI, insistently manifested, that properly qualified young priests should be sent to the Roman Pontifical Institute of Sacred Music. The letter also referred to the Apostolic Letter of Pius XI, *Divini cultus sanctitatem,* issued Dec. 20, 1928,[4] which recom-

[1] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XLI (1949), 650.

[2] *Ibid.,* p. 617.

[3] *Ibid.,* p. 618.

[4] Bouscaren, *The Canon Law Digest,* I (Milwaukee: Bruce, 1934), 398, 399; *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* XXI (1929), 33.

mended to Ordinaries that in seminaries and houses of study there should be short, but frequent and almost daily, practice in reading and singing sacred music.

The same number of the *Acta* reports the allocution of our Holy Father to the jurists gathered in Rome for a national convention. This allocution was that which created an occasion for censure on the part of certain American publications. It was delivered on Nov. 6, 1949.[5] The Pope lauded the choice of Rome for their first convention since it so appropriately invited them in their role both as jurists and as Catholics; in their role as jurists they could see that ancient Rome is the great mother of law who has left behind her a tradition that has defied the voracious tooth of time, while in their role as Catholics they recognized the new throne of truth firmly established by the first Head of the Church which had resisted the onslaughts of time as a visible sign of the permanence of the work of Christ. Moreover, the interplay of the two forces which met in their highest significance in Rome made it clear, our Holy Father said, that there was no opposition but rather the highest degree of harmony between true juridical science and the Faith.

Our Holy Father then praised the nobility of their profession by describing it in the words of Ulpian, the great Roman jurist, who defined jurisprudence as the knowledge of what is divine and human, the science of what is just and unjust. The knowledge of the divine is thus made prerequisite to a proper knowledge of what is human and, consequently, to an adequate understanding of law, since, in the words of Cicero, the nature of law must be sought from the nature of man. Thus, concludes our Holy Father, what is divine and what is human are so intimately connected that one cannot be ignorant of the first without losing an exact evaluation of the second. Indeed, the knowledge of what is just and what unjust demands a knowledge of the order in creation and consequently of the Creator, since justice is something that inheres in man, in society, and in the fundamental institutions of the latter as the cause of the practical principles which it provides and imposes and of those universal norms of conduct which are a part of the objective human and civil order, determined by the mind of God. Moreover, the Catholic jurist sees the human element not

[5] *Acta Apostolicae Sedis*, XLI (1949), 597.

merely in its humanity but as a humanity redeemed and destined to eternal happiness.

It was then that our Holy Father pointed to the conflicts that confront a Catholic jurist when, in contrast to the high concept of the dignity of his profession just explained by the Pope, he runs headlong into the contrasting milieu of juridical positivism. In order to render some degree of aid to them he proceeded to particularize their obligations in reference to the Godless and materialistic tenets which blocked their way in the practice of their profession. His observations were offered under four classifications.

(1) He noted that a judge cannot escape responsibility for his decision by casting it back on the law and the legislator, who are, indeed, primarily responsible for it; but when a judge applies it to a particular case by his decision he becomes equally responsible for the consequences.

(2) He insisted further that a judge cannot, by his decision, compel anyone to perform an act that is intrinsically evil, that is, contrary to the law of God or the Church.

(3) He contended that in no case can the judge expressly approve an unjust law (a law which, indeed, cannot form the basis for a decision that is valid in conscience and before God); and for that reason he cannot render a penal decision which is the equivalent of an approval. Moreover, his responsibility in this connection is the greater if his sentence gives rise to public scandal.

(4) He conceded that not every application of an unjust law is the equivalent of an approval of it. In some cases, the judge may, and perhaps should, let the unjust law take its course, that is, when it is the only means of preventing a greater evil. He can even impose a penalty for the violation of an unjust law if the violator is reasonably disposed to accept it to escape that evil or to secure some advantage of a higher order and if the judge can prudently surmise that the penalty will be thus freely accepted by the violator. In times of persecution, priests and laymen may allow themselves to be condemned, without resistance, and by Catholic magistrates, to fine and imprisonment for infringement of unjust laws, when in this way it is possible to preserve for the people an honest judiciary and to turn away from the Church and the faithful a worse calamity. However, this principle does not extend to the imposition of the death sentence. And only for reasons of the highest moment may a

Catholic judge render a decree of divorce in the case of a marriage that is valid before God and the Church. He may not deceive himself that such a decree touches only the civil effects, for in reality it is the strongest of inducements to the erroneous conclusion that the marriage is completely destroyed by it.

In his allocution to the Auditors of the Sacred Roman Rota, delivered Nov. 13, 1949,[6] our Holy Father also directed his attention to the erroneous conclusions of juridical positivism which, by taking away from law the foundation established by the divine natural and positive law, leaves for law only the support of the State, which thus becomes the sole determinant of what is and what is not law. In this situation, one finds as a consequence the absolute State. On the other hand, it is not enough to create true law that a norm has been established as obligatory by the legislative authority of the State. The criterion of true law can be found only in Him who is the Author and the sovereign Rule by which all law must be measured. Reliance only on the will of the State as the determining factor in the constitution of true law explains how public officials, in accepting that point of view, can become criminals in relation to the law of God. The crisis which juridical positivism has thus created in the administration of secular justice is not experienced by judges sitting in ecclesiastical tribunals, for the science and the practice of canon law does not recognize any positive law that is not at the same time true law, for their function is to direct, within the limits set by the divine law, the ecclesiastical juridical system to the attainment of the Church's end, the good of souls and their eternal salvation.

On Nov. 21, 1949,[7] our Holy Father directed a radio message to shut-ins, assuring them of his desire to visit each one individually and of his hope that his words might in some measure compensate for his inability to do this. The purpose of his message, he explained, was connected with the approaching Holy Year, in preparation for which he desired to aid them the better to understand and appreciate the benefits which they could derive from meditation on the Passion of Our Lord; moreover, he hoped in this way to lighten the burden of their suffering with patience, to enlighten it with hope, and to transfigure it with the awareness of its value and its fruitfulness.

[6] *Ibid.*, p. 604.

[7] *Ibid.*, p. 610.

On Nov. 27, 1949,[8] our Holy Father addressed an allocution to the Honorable Francisco de Paula Perez, on the occasion on which the latter presented to the Holy Father his credentials as Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary at the Holy See. Our Holy Father praised the Ambassador as a man of letters whose life was consecrated to the pursuit of juridical knowledge and who had thus become one of the most esteemed authorities in constitutional law in his country. This background of live contact with the fundamental aspects and the realities of the economic and the social world had given the Ambassador, said our Holy Father, that social instinct which is so necessary to confront the problems of society, coupled with the high degree of seriousness and constancy indispensable to sane and enduring solutions of those problems. Our Holy Father said that he found in the words of the Ambassador the assurance that the latter recognized in his office a mission both important and meritorious. He assured him of his daily prayers for the people of Colombia and added that out of love for them he called to mind that the future of a people or of a nation should not be made to depend on violence.

In a secret consistory held Dec. 12, 1949,[9] our Holy Father expressed his intention of opening the Holy Door of the Vatican Basilica on Christmas Eve; at the same time he designated his Legates for the opening, at the same hour, of the Holy Doors of the other three Patriarchal Basilicas: for that of St. Paul Outside the Walls, Eugene Cardinal Tisserant; for that of the Lateran Basilica, Clemente Cardinal Micara; and for that of St. Mary Major, Alessandro Cardinal Verde.

On June 30, 1949,[10] our Holy Father addressed a letter to the Superior General of the Marianists to commemorate the first centenary of the death of Guillaume Joseph Chaminade, their Founder. A second letter, dated Aug. 12, 1949,[11] was sent to the Archbishop of Paderborn in response to a letter of the St. Boniface Society on the completion of a century of labor in the promotion of the spiritual and temporal undertakings of the Church. A third letter, dated Oct. 18, 1949,[12] was sent to the German Hierarchy assembled at Fulda.

Two Apostolic Constitutions affected the territorial subdivisions

[8] *Ibid.*, p. 608.
[9] *Ibid.*, pp. 579, 580.
[10] *Ibid.*, p. 591.
[11] *Ibid.*, p. 593.
[12] *Ibid.*, p. 595.

of the Church: one, dated June 9, 1949,[13] established two Prefectures Apostolic, that of Yangchow and Haichow, from territory taken from the northern part of the Diocese of Shanghai; the other, of the same date,[14] established the new Diocese of Soochow from territory taken from the middle portion of the Diocese of Shanghai.

The last number of the *Acta* for 1949 prints the decretal letters covering the canonization of Blessed Michael Garicoïts, dated July 6, 1947,[15] as well as the decretal letters of the same date [16] covering the canonization of Blessed Jean Elisabeth Bichier des Ages.

Two decrees of the Sacred Congregation of Rites passed favorably on the miracles required in the one case for the canonization of Blessed Vincenzo Maria Strambi (dated July 31, 1949)[17] and in the other, for the beatification of Venerable Vincenzo Pallotti (dated Nov. 27, 1949).[18]

The elevation of the following members of the Hierarchy in the United States is reported in the second last number of the *Acta* for 1949: Most Rev. Leo Binz, D.D., Titular Archbishop of Silio and Coadjutor to the Archbishop of Dubuque; Most Rev. Francis E. Hyland, D.D., Titular Bishop of Gomphi and Auxiliary of Savannah-Atlanta; and Most Rev. James H. Griffiths, D.D., Titular Bishop of Gaza and Auxiliary of His Eminence, Francis Cardinal Spellman. The date of these appointments is Oct. 15, 1949.[19] Under date of Oct. 17, 1949,[20] there is reported the appointment of Most Rev. Francis M. Kelly, D.D., to the Titular See of Nasai.

JEROME D. HANNAN

*The Catholic University of America*
*Washington, D. C.*

[13] *Ibid.*, p. 586.
[14] *Ibid.*, p. 588.
[15] *Ibid.*, p. 625.
[16] *Ibid.*, p. 637.
[17] *Ibid.*, p. 651.
[18] *Ibid.*, p. 653.
[19] *Ibid.*, p. 615.
[20] *Loc. cit.*

# Book Reviews

INTRODUCTION TO THE DEVOUT LIFE. By St. Francis de Sales. Translated and edited by John K. Ryan. New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950. Pp. xxix + 256. $3.00.

In the opening decade of the seventeenth century St. Francis de Sales published the *Introduction to the Devout Life*. Since then this valuable book has stood the test of time. Published anew in the twentieth century the *Introduction* is still timely; it will always be timely because it is timeless.

St. Francis de Sales was convinced that the "devout life" was never meant to be the monopoly of the priesthood or religious life. Sanctity "in the world" is not only possible but necessary and indispensable. He wishes to instruct those who live in towns, in families or at court, and to encourage them to undertake a devout life (p. xxv). On this aspect of St. Francis' teaching, Msgr. Ryan remarks: "The life of devotion is as open to the soldier, the shopkeeper, the courtier, the man of affairs, and the woman in the home as it is to the desert solitary and the nun in her cell" (p. xi). In accomplishing this St. Francis has had great success. He has made sanctity attractive and palatable. His theme could be worded in the verse of the psalm: "Taste and see that the Lord is sweet." This does not mean that there is anything soft in the spirituality of the Bishop of Geneva. In this regard there is a parallel between the teaching of St. Francis de Sales and the Little Flower. Some speak about them in terms that are disgustingly cloying. The fact that the spirituality of both saints is attractive does not say that one does not need a strong and grim determination to carry it into practice.

The *Introduction* is divided into five parts. The first contains instructions for bringing the soul to a full resolution to embrace the devout life. The second treats the manner in which prayer and the sacraments elevate the soul to God. The practice of the various virtues forms the subject matter of the third part. The fourth contains counsels against the most usual temptations. In the final section the saint gives various instructions calculated to renew the soul and confirm her in devotion. These few lines show that the author has run the gamut of the spiritual life. The conferences reveal a true man of God who himself led a devout life and who could speak from experience; they reveal a master of the spiritual life, a devoted pastor of souls, a keen psychologist with a profound understanding of human nature. In the best sense of the word he analyzes the soul; in fact many of his conferences are antidotes against modern psychiatric ills. In this regard one could

single out his chapters on patience (pp. 82-85), on humility (pp. 85-97), on meekness and anger (pp. 97-102), on attending to affairs with diligence but without eagerness (pp. 102-104), on temptations (pp. 181-86), on anxiety and sadness (pp. 192-96).

This edition of the *Introduction to the Devout Life* is one that is a joy to recommend. The volume itself is an excellent piece of book making and is well worth the modest price of three dollars. It contains an introduction by the editor in which he treats the occasion of the work and previous editions, a chronology of the principal dates in the life of St. Francis de Sales, St. Francis' own preface, dedicatory prayer, and notices to the second and third edition, the complete text of the *Introduction,* notes and references, and an index of proper names.

The English translation is based on Dom Mackey's critical text of the *Introduction,* and on the traditional translations of John Yaworth and the English priests of Tournay College. First let it be said that we rejoice in seeing the complete text in English translation. A spiritual masterpiece, like the present, suffers in abridgement. On the whole the translation is smooth and good. Here and there, especially in the chapters dealing with marriage, phrases are used that are stiff and archaic. Such phrases as: to debauch the marriage bed, nuptial commerce and corporal commerce, etc. are out of vogue. Perhaps these could be modernized in a second printing?

In its own day the *Introduction to the Devout Life,* along with other devotional literature of the post-Reformation period, did a great deal to revive Catholic life. Today in America there is a thirst among many for the things of the Spirit. This book will help many in their quest for God; it will help all in their life in God. It will help realize St. Francis' prayer that Christ will reign in our hearts. The *Introduction to the Devout Life* will be a guide to the eternal life of glory.

ALFRED C. RUSH, C.SS.R.

ST. IGNATIUS OF LOYOLA. By Père Paul Dudon, S. J. Translated by William J. Young, S.J. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company, 1949. Pp. xiv + 484. $5.00.

Except for a few minor details this biography of St. Ignatius is the same as that which was published as a memorial of the four-hundredth anniversary of the first vows of St. Ignatius and his companions at Montmartre, and which on more than one occasion has been called "the book of the centenary." The preface, which was written primarily for French readers, has been slightly abridged; five or six short notes have been added by the translator to clarify passages that might be a source

of misunderstanding; nine of the original twenty appendices have been suppressed; and a sorely needed index has been added to what Fr. James Brodrick has described in *The Origin of the Jesuits* as a "sober, scholarly, but un-indexed book."

*St. Ignatius of Loyola* is by no means the simple retelling of a well-known story. It is a new interpretation of the life and times of the saint in the light of the enormous amount of historical data that has come to light in the past sixty years. Fr. Dudon was fortunate in writing at a time when practically all the documents pertaining directly to St. Ignatius and the first members of the Society of Jesus had appeared in the *Monumenta historica societatis Jesu*. The sixty-two volumes, complete or in proof, that were available to Fr. Dudon, cover a period of approximately thirty-five years. In addition to the *Monumenta*, Fr. Dudon had at his disposal the compendious histories of the Society of Jesus in Spain and Italy written by Fathers Astrain and Tacchi Venturi. Wherever possible without burdening the reader with useless references Fr. Dudon quotes his original sources. To Fr. Leonard Cros, who for twenty years delved into neglected Spanish archives and who left at his death an abundance of fresh material dealing with the early life of St. Ignatius, the author expresses a particular indebtedness.

In keeping with his historical approach, Fr. Dudon makes a chronological division of his work. The volume is divided into the following five "books:" *Awaiting the Call, Preparing for the Apostolate, The Spiritual Guide, The Founder,* and *The Servant of God.*

Despite this logical division, the manifold aspects of the saint's life are not all treated with proportionate emphasis. The first two books are somewhat lengthy and monotonous. The chapter devoted to St. Ignatius' government of the Society of Jesus is somewhat brief, and a number of facets in the saint's character have hardly been touched. Very little is said about Ignatius' zeal for the foreign missions, his interest in schools, his mystical experiences. These omissions may be due to the fact that the original editor of the book in the interest of economy used the scissors rather freely on Fr. Dudon's manuscript.

With other modern historians the present hagiographer demonstrates the fact that Ignatius before his conversion was pretty much a man of his world, and not the paragon of gallantry that many of his earlier admirers would have had him to be. Fr. Dudon discredits the tradition that the *Spiritual Exercises* were dictated to St. Ignatius by the Blessed Virgin at Manresa, and maintains that the concept of a new religious order dawned late and slowly on the mind of the saint.

In the copious bibliography cited by Fr. Dudon it is rather surprising to find only one English biography mentioned, *Saint Ignatius Loyola* by Francis Thomson. He overlooks the earlier work of "Stewart Rose,"

the pen name af Catherine Stewart Erskine, Lady Buchanan, which is the source of much in Thomson. While giving full credit to the German Protestant scholar Henrich Böhmer for his work on the history of the Society of Jesus, Fr. Dudon seems to have been unaware of the more recent and highly capable biographies of St. Ignatius by the American Protestant historians H. Dwight Sedgwick and Paul Van Dyke.

Since Fr. Dudon's method of procedure is primarily scientific, it would have been to the advantage of his book and to that of his subject to bring the bibliography up to date. In a number of respects his life of St. Ignatius is a pioneer work, and more recent scholars have elaborated points which he failed to discuss with sufficient clarity. Fr. Leturia has restudied the whole of St. Ignatius' early life. Fr. James Brodrick has written two very readable volumes on the origins and progress of the Jesuits. His *Saint Peter Canisius, S.J.,* is invaluable for understanding the difficulties confronting the followers of Ignatius in Germany. Fathers de Guibert, Iparraguirre, Pinard de la Boullaye, Przywara, Rahner, Schilgen, and Smits van Waesberghe in the past few years have made valuable contributions to a better understanding of St. Ignatius' spiritual teachings.

*St. Ignatius of Loyola* will probably remain for some time the standard comprehensive biography of the saint. English-speaking Catholics will certainly be grateful for the present translation. It is recommended to all serious readers as an excellent means of getting a better understanding of this great soldier, apostle, administrator, mystic, saint, and the highly complex age in which he lived.

M. Joseph Costelloe, S.J.

The Christian Virtues. By Rev. Charles E. Sheedy, C.S.C. Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 1949. Pp. ix + 360. $2.50.

Fr. Sheedy starts his first chapter on "The Nature of Moral Theology" by merely touching on the inane controversy as to whether religion or theology should be the content of collegiate instruction. "Religion," he states, "is man's response to God, his worship of God." And again, "Religion is love, first the love of God, and then the love of neighbor for the sake of God."

While, in his treatment of the virtues, Fr. Sheedy follows the order and content of Fr. Benedict Merkelbach, O.P., he succeeds admirably in bringing moral theology to the service of religion. He writes clearly, breaking away from the "What-is-a-sin" type of religious instruction. No other textbook in English has portrayed the virtues in so attractive a fashion.

One major criticism in the work is that, while emphasizing in the first chapter the supremacy of charity, only forty-six of the 360 pages are devoted to this virtue—and twenty of those to "sins against Divine Charity." The Gospels tell another story. The treatment of Prudence, Fortitude, and Temperance, however, is most satisfactory.

More stress might have been placed upon the positive values of Faith and less upon sins against Faith. Marriage is not treated in this volume as the author rightly assumes it should be the subject of a special college religion course.

The best college religion text is written with the student on the other side of the table. Fr. Sheedy has made a valuable contribution to the field of college religion. Realizing the necessity of giving the student the essentials, he may find it possible in further editions to eliminate some of the material contained in this text. The reviewer suggests that Chapters XIV to XVIII might be treated in a course on Ethics apart from the religion course.

MSGR. MAURICE S. SHEEHY

THE LITURGICAL ALTAR. By Geoffrey Webb. 2nd ed. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1949. Pp. 117. $2.25.

This little volume condenses into a hundred small pages all that one needs to know about the correct altar. "Since the Eucharistic Sacrifice is the centre of the Catholic Liturgy, it follows that the altar of sacrifice is the central and culminating point of the edifice, and its position and form should be so designed as to give expression to this prominence" (p. 22). With this as a fundamental concept, the author contrasts the altar which is the stone of sacrifice and the altar which is a structure of gradines for flowers and candlelabra, emphasizing the prime defect of the unliturgical altar, which seems to be designed more for occasional use as a throne of exposition than for regular service in the Eucharistic immolation.

The first section of the book traces the development of the altar from the domestic wooden table of the Last Supper through the cubical block of stone of primitive centuries to the medieval high altar, with its reredos or dossal which retreated farther and farther into the apse of the church.

The greater portion of the book is devoted to a consideration of the rubrics governing the altar and its appurtenances. Practical suggestions concerning details such as dimensions and the position of the throne of exposition, whether permanent or movable, punctuate the directions taken from the official regulations which govern the con-

struction and furnishing of the altar. A brief section on artistic examples of pre-Reformation liturgical observance in England concludes the book.

There is a satisfactory index but, unfortunately, no bibliography. The book may be recommended, without hesitation, to those engaged in the building or restoration of churches, who interpret artistic beauty in terms of liturgical correctness.

WILLIAM J. LALLOU

TWO WAYS OF LIFE. By F. Sherwood Taylor, M.A., B.Sc., Ph.D. Westminster, Md.: The Newman Press, 1949, Pp. viii + iii. $2.00.

This treatise has been written by Dr. F. Sherwood Taylor, Curator of the Museum of the History of Science at Oxford. As a scientist and a Christian the author discusses the two principal philosophies of today, namely Christianity and materialism. The treatise contains six chapters in which the choice of a philosophy, inherent difficulties of the two philosophies, the inner life of the two philosophies, the fruit of the two philosophies in personal relationships, the social effect of the two philosophies, and the results of the two philosophies are critically examined, and the conclusion reached that the materialism of those who base their lives upon natural science in contrast to the integral philosophy of the Christian is destructive of all that is held to be good in the private and public relationships of individuals.

In arriving at this conclusion the author applied the same method to these two philosophies of life as is used in testing the truth of a scientific theory. The scientist is not interested primarily in examining the manner in which the theory was derived, but in testing its usefulness in explaining natural phenomena and enabling men to predict and control them. In similar manner an examination of the effect of the adoption of one or the other philosophy upon the individual, family, or state reveals their respective worth.

The treatise is well written and the truths contained in it are clearly and logically presented. It should prove serviceable to the general reader as well as to the student of philosophy and of science.

FRANCIS P. CASSIDY

TO HEAVEN THROUGH A WINDOW. By Rev. John Carr, C.SS.R. New York: Declan X. McMullen Co., 1949. Pp. xvi + 303. $3.50.

Very few saints enjoy a universal popularity. One can think of St. Anthony of Padua and St. Therese of Lisieux. It is difficult to explain,